

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, June 8, 1989

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Reverend William H. Carr, St. Augustine's Catholic Church, Richmond, VA, offered the following prayer:

All powerful and ever-living God, we do well to offer You praise today, and to give You thanks in all we do.

You spoke a message of peace and taught us to live as brothers and sisters. Your message took form in the vision of our forefathers as they fashioned a nation where men and women might live as one. Your message lives on in our midst as a task for us today and a promise for tomorrow.

We thank You, Father, for Your blessings in the past and for all that, with Your help, we must yet achieve. Send Your blessing, we pray, upon this body; help them to acknowledge that You are the Ruler of Nations and that, with Your divine help, peace and justice can be achieved in this land, in this world.

Help us, O God, for You are God, now and always. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] if he would kindly come forward and lead the membership in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. OBEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## WELCOME TO THE REVEREND WILLIAM H. CARR

(Mr. BLILEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to welcome our guest chaplain, the Reverend William H. Carr of St. Augustine's Catholic Church in Richmond.

This year Father Carr celebrates the 20th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood. Over the past 20 years he has touched the lives of many Vir-

ginians, but he especially has enriched the lives of the State's youth. For 5 years Father Carr served as the State director for Catholic youth activities. In the early 1970's he organized masses in Richmond to spiritually support the families of young soldiers being held as prisoners of war in Vietnam.

Even with his involvement in community work, Father Carr has continued to devote much of his time and energy to his parish and is well-loved by the congregation of St. Augustine's where he has been pastor for 6 years.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating this highly esteemed clergyman who has committed his life to God and to serving his fellow man.

## WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION FOR CONTRACT EMPLOYEES

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, one of the very first major pieces of legislation that President Bush signed this year was the Whistleblower Protection Act. This was for people in the civil service, and I was very, very proud that he made that an early-on signature, because President Reagan had vetoed it. I think he sent the wrong message.

I am very pleased now that we have dealt with whistleblower protections for defense employees, whistleblower protections for civil employees, but we have not dealt with the contract employees, and that is very important.

In my district we are seeing a terrific scandal with the DOE and a nuclear weapons plant that was all brought to light by whistleblowers.

We have known that defense contract whistleblowers have been important in showing waste, fraud, and abuse, and NASA whistleblowers, when pointing out that the O-rings did not work.

Yesterday I introduced the whistleblower protection for contract employees. I think it is very important that we close the gap in this whole area and make the circle complete. I certainly hope people will join me in co-sponsoring it and, once and for all, when people do the right thing and help us fight waste, fraud, and abuse, they are protected rather than sacrificed.

## ANOTHER CRISIS BREWING AT OUR FEET

(Mr. GEKAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, there is another crisis brewing right at our feet, one of our own making.

In 1987, when the Congress passed OBRA, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of that year, it included a provision in it that mandated that by July 1, 1989, fast approaching us, nurse's aides in nursing homes would have to be certified and to pass competency examinations before they can retain their positions. This is a ghastly prospect for our nursing homes.

If Members talk to their own nursing homes in their districts and to the nursing communities within those nursing homes and to the nurse's aides themselves, they will find out many of them are going to resign, nurse's aides, rather than have to undergo a competency examination.

Some of them have been on the job offering tender care to our elderly patients for 20 years or more, who never had to take an examination, and yet are the most stalwart, best qualified, experienced people we have to tend to the ailing patient community in the nursing homes. We are cutting off our own noses to spite our faces when we insist that they become competent at something at which they are already competent.

I am asking Members to join in legislation that I have introduced and which now is lodged in subcommittees chaired by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] and the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. STARK], and ask them to have hearings on this matter so that we can see if we can at least grandfather in those long-time employees, nurse's aides, who have done such a splendid job until now.

## TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JOHN LEWIS

(Mr. DARDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, just 30 years ago in most parts of the South, a young black man could not enter the college of his choice, no matter how bright or energetic he might have been. JOHN LEWIS, who today is our colleague in this House, was one of

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

many whose educational aspirations were limited by the segregation policies of that day.

Last week, in an act which is symbolic of the progress of race relations in our region, and indeed across the entire Nation, JOHN LEWIS was awarded an honorary doctorate of law degree from Troy State University in Alabama. It was Troy State which, 30 years earlier, as an all white institution, refused to even consider his application to enter its undergraduate program.

Ironically, JOHN LEWIS' letter to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., seeking support for his application to Troy State, led to JOHN's historic involvement in the civil rights movement.

All of us can be proud of the role our colleague, JOHN LEWIS of Georgia, played in breaking down the barriers of racial segregation in this Nation. Thanks to his efforts and the devotion of so many others to the cause of civil rights, the color of their skin will never again prevent any of our young people from entering the college of their choice.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of inquiring of my friend from California, the majority leader, the program for next week.

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday next, we will meet at noon, and there will be no legislative business. On Tuesday, we will meet at noon, and we will have three suspensions. Recorded votes on the suspensions will be postponed until after the debate on all suspensions.

□ 1010

The gentleman has the bills in front of him. So I will not go through each one:

H.R. 1502, District of Columbia Police Authorization and Expansion Act of 1989;

H. Con. Res. 113, calling on the Government of Vietnam to expedite the release and emigration of reeducation camp detainees; and

H. Res. 120, to express the sense of the House in support of actions to eliminate preventable deaths and disabling illness, especially among children, and of efforts to attain the United Nations goals of universal childhood immunization by 1990 and health for all by the year 2000.

On Wednesday we will meet at noon and on Thursday we will meet at 10 a.m.

The bill under discussion for Wednesday and Thursday will be the rule on the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act of 1989. We will do the rule; and then we will do the bill, starting on the bill itself on Wednesday and hoping to complete action on Thursday.

We will be sending the minimum wage bill to the President on Tuesday and depending on when the President takes action on that, and what action he might take, the House may then be required to take action next week. But that will all depend on the President's action.

On Friday the House will not be in session.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me ask, if I might, two questions about what is coming up next week. The first is, as I am sure my colleague is aware, on Wednesday we have one of the major events of the year from the standpoint of the Republican Party involving the President of the United States, and that begins about 6:30. I was wondering if we can try to work out in such a way that by agreeing to go in at noon we can also try to rise in terms of any votes by around 6 on Wednesday and then be able to try to finish up on Thursday. I wonder if that might be possible.

Mr. COELHO. The distinguished Whip can be assured that the leadership will be very cooperative with this side of the aisle and with the President.

Mr. GINGRICH. Then, second, I wanted to ask for just a moment, there is some very real concern on our side of the aisle as we approach H.R. 1278 on Wednesday, which is one of the most important bills we will take up this year, the savings and loan bill, an extraordinarily important bill where there has been a lot of bipartisan effort, it is our understanding that a significant portion of the bill was rewritten after it came out of committee and that there may well be a parliamentary problem in terms of the bill that the committee voted out and the scale of corrections which exceeds the technical definition and becomes substantive, and I just wanted to let the House know that there may be some very real concerns raised both in the Committee on Rules and on the floor on Tuesday and Wednesday as we try to take it up. I would hope that on a bipartisan basis we can walk through what is, I think, a very difficult moment for both sides of the aisle since it is such an unusual procedure to have that scale of change in the bill after the committee has actually passed it out of committee.

I would be glad to yield if the gentleman would like to comment. I just

wanted to lay that out as we discussed the schedule for next week.

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the information from the minority side. This is, of course, one of the more important bills that we consider in this session, and as it is an important bill for the administration, hopefully, it is something that we can work together on in a bipartisan way to report this bill out, to get it to the President quickly.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me say finally, and I appreciate very much my colleague's help in all this, I think it is fair next week to say that we will probably end fairly late on Thursday and that Members should be aware of that and that in this week in particular I think it is Republicans who have to take some of the burden because of the comity being shown by the Democratic leadership. So for whatever inconvenience we have, I do think, as I understand it, there will be an effort to finish the bill, whatever it takes on Thursday. It is a very important bill and very high on the President's priorities.

So I just want to say publicly I realize full well to what degree your bending over to help us on Wednesday may lead us to bear a little bit of a burden for the length of time it takes on Thursday.

Mr. COELHO. If the gentleman will yield, I think the gentleman is correct. If we do rise at an early hour on Wednesday earlier than we anticipated because of activities involving the President that would necessitate us staying later on Thursday, and all Members should be so advised at this particular point.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, does fairly late mean after 8 o'clock on Thursday?

Mr. COELHO. If the gentleman will yield, very late means however late you want to be to complete the bill.

Mr. GINGRICH. I think that is a fair point. This is a very important piece of legislation. As many people have said, it is a good time for us to go on and focus on legislation.

Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BARNARD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, and just by chance being here this morning to hear this dialog, I am somewhat concerned about the statement that so much of the bill has been rewritten after the committee has reported the bill. And I



would interpret from what the conversation was that there will be points of order brought against the bill because of that particular matter?

Mr. GINGRICH. If I might say to my friend who is a very distinguished leader in the Committee on Banking, it is my understanding—I am not on the Banking Committee and I am not expert in this area—it is my understanding that in the housing section of the bill there were some substantive rather than technical changes made without any consultation on the Republican side and after the bill had left the committee. I understand that there will be an effort made at the Rules Committee to ensure that the bill as written by the committee is a base vehicle and not the bill as rewritten. But certainly in the savings and loan sections there is no problem.

Mr. BARNARD. In other words, what the gentleman is saying is that is being communicated both at the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Banking so we are not going to have any surprises on the floor when this bill develops.

Mr. GINGRICH. No. In fact I might say the specific reason I wanted, with the generous help of the majority leader, to bring this out right now for Members to be aware is I think there is every possibility that on a bipartisan basis the leadership on both sides can solve it. But I would say on our side that it is such a fundamental question of the importance of the committee and what does it mean when you ask for technical corrections, that I think we would hope that we could have the base bill be the bill which came from the committee originally and not the bill as it apparently was revised.

Mr. BARNARD. Let me say I certainly concur in that. Our only admonition, of course, is that there be no surprises because this is one of the most important pieces of legislation that we are going to address this year. Up to this point it has been a bipartisan bill; we have taken the President's bill and we have worked with it as likewise the Senate has. So hopefully we will have all caution flags acknowledged before we get into the bill.

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COELHO. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say something before our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Upton] leaves the floor: There was a question about how late Thursday night. I want to clarify that and say that we would anticipate staying late Thursday night, but if it is clear that we cannot complete the bill Thursday night as a result of us rising early on Wednesday, the membership should be on notice

that we will meet on Friday if necessary to complete this bill this week.

So that we will go as late as possible on Wednesday in cooperation with the other side of the aisle and the President, we will work all day Thursday and try to complete this bill and work late Thursday, but if necessary to complete the bill we have to be here on Friday, we will be in on Friday.

So Members should be on notice.

Mr. GINGRICH. Well, let me say again we are very willing to amend the time we come in on Wednesday because of the gentleman's caucus. The gentleman is being very generous in helping us Wednesday evening. I think Members, looking honestly at the schedule so far this year, have little cause to complain, if in dealing with one of the President's most important items we take the time to do it thoroughly, to allow Members a chance to amend and to debate even if it means ending up here on a Friday.

So I just want to step forward and say on a bipartisan basis that we will take our half of the guff for this. This is a legitimate, serious thing to do, and we will take the time necessary to do it. I appreciate the Speaker and the majority leader being so cooperative in this.

Mr. COELHO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GINGRICH. I thank the Speaker.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 12, 1989

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### HOURLY MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, JUNE 14, 1989

Mr. COELHO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, June 13, 1989, it adjourn to meet at 1 p.m. on Wednesday, June 14, 1989.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### THE WORLD WATCHES AS CHINA ERUPTS

(Mr. WALSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the advent of global communications and the global village. But this past 7 days has been perhaps the most remarkable of this new era.

Most dramatic have been the events of China. Student protest, massive repression, and slaughter have brought that great nation to the brink of civil war.

We, the villagers of the globe, have watched in awe this entire drama on our televisions. The dictators of the world must now realize—we are all watching. American, Pole, African, Australian—we are looking out the front window via television and seeing what is really happening.

The most poignant message for me was a Chinese worker who was interviewed on CBS. He said, "the leaders say we don't support the students, that they are hooligans and criminals. That few have been killed. They are liars. Our leaders are now telling the truth. Tell the world. Tell the world."

I say back to that man: We hear you. We believe you. And we wish you well in your great struggle for democracy.

Long live freedom in China.

□ 1020

#### INDEPENDENT AGENCY NEEDED TO POLICE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

(Mr. SKAGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SKAGGS. Tuesday of this week we witnessed an unprecedented event in which over 70 FBI and EPA agents descended upon a Federal nuclear weapons plant in my district at Rocky Flats to carry out an investigation of alleged violations of the Nation's environmental laws.

The violations involved wrongful disposal of hazardous and radioactive wastes and efforts to conceal that fact. Then yesterday the Colorado Department of Health announced a long list of notices of violations to the Rocky Flats plant involving further violations of the environmental permits for the operation of that plant. All of this, I think, is further evidence, if any evidence was needed, that the Department of Energy is simply incapable of effectively policing their own operations in the area of health, safety, and environmental compliance.

Two months ago I introduced a bill that would establish what I believe is a necessary remedy, an independent

agency with effective authority in enforcement in standard setting, to make sure that these terribly sensitive functions of our national security operation are carried out in a manner in which the public can have the necessary trust and confidence.

Under current circumstances, we hope we will address this issue as we consider the defense authorization bill in the coming week and a half. I would ask my colleagues to join me in co-sponsoring H.R. 1643.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair wishes to announce that by virtue of the election of the Speaker, the positions held by the Chair as the majority leadership member on the Committee on the Budget and as ex officio member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence are, without objection, deemed vacated.

There was no objection.

#### SUDAN NEEDS PEACE

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, Col. John Garang, who is the leader of the Sudanese People's Liberation Army which is fighting a civil war against the Government of Sudan, is in Washington this week and has been meeting with Government officials and Members of Congress about the situation in Sudan.

As many of you know, between 250,000 and 500,000 Sudanese died last year as a result of a famine in that country fueled by the civil war. Peace is the only permanent solution to the famine in that country and I want to share with my colleagues a letter that Mr. McNULTY and I have sent to Colonel Garang to encourage peace:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, June 7, 1989.

Col. JOHN GARANG,  
Sudanese People's Liberation Army,  
Sudan.

DEAR COLONEL GARANG: Your visit to the United States presents a unique opportunity to show the American people and the world community that you are committed to peace. While hundreds of thousands of Sudanese people died of starvation last year, the underlying cause of their death was the brutal civil war. It is clear that unless peace is reached, the suffering and death will continue.

During our travels to Sudan, in both the north and the south, we were struck by the fact that virtually everyone we spoke with wanted peace. We both met with Sudanese Prime Minister Sadiq al Mahdi and, in separate meetings, he assured us of his desire for peace. We have both met with you and you have assured each us of your desire for peace.

We were encouraged by your commitment to ensure that humanitarian relief reaches

needy Sudanese. Your offer on May 1 of a 30-day unilateral cease-fire and offer to extend it for 15 days is a positive step toward peace. A cease-fire, however, is not peace. Even during the current cease-fire, which was implemented to permit food shipments to the famine victims, convoys have been fired upon and lives have been lost.

Talks between the Sudanese People's Liberation Army and representatives of the Government of Sudan are scheduled for June 10 and offer the potential for a negotiated settlement to the civil war in Sudan.

In light of the upcoming talks, we urge you in the strongest possible manner to assure the American people of your intention to use the coming discussions as a vehicle for achieving peace in Sudan. This will not be easy, but rather will require an incremental approach that builds on areas of agreement leading to resolution of areas of disagreement.

Your commitment to peace is the single most constructive step that can result from your visit to the United States.

Without your wholehearted commitment and good faith efforts to seek peace, the suffering will continue and innocent men, women and children will die. This is not acceptable to the American people or to the world community.

While you have received praise during your visit to the United States for your commitment to humanitarian relief efforts, this must be backed by action that convinces the American people that your commitment to peace—the underlying solution to many of Sudan's problems—is also sincere.

The ball is in your court: your statement that peace is your top priority for the June 10 talks will assure the American people, including the many government officials and members of Congress with whom you met, that your intentions are sincere. Your failure to take this important step will be a grave disappointment to the American people.

Sincerely,

FRANK R. WOLF,  
MICHAEL R. McNULTY,  
Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this issue is critically important for the hundreds of thousands of Sudanese men, women, and children who are at risk. I hope my colleagues will join Mr. McNULTY and me in pressing Colonel Garang and the Government of Sudan for peace.

#### APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO THE U.S. DELEGATION TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON INDOCHINESE REFUGEES

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce the appointment of the following Members to the U.S. delegation to the International Conference on Indochinese Refugees:

Mr. EDWARD F. FEIGHAN of Ohio; and Mr. ROBERT K. DORNAN of California.

#### WILL DEMOCRACY SURVIVE?

(Mr. McEWEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise once again to express my appreciation and admiration for the excellent resolution that was presented to

the floor yesterday by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], as well as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

Mr. Speaker, the world has changed in recent years. There was a time when I was in college, not too long ago, when the Chinese were murdering 40 million of their own people in which college students and those on the left walked around our Nation carrying the little red book, praising Mao. There was a time when the Soviet Union could destroy 14 million Ukrainians by starvation, and yet the left praised the revolution that was going on in the Soviet Union. There was a time when Nikita Khrushchev and Josef Stalin could murder 30 million of their own people in the Soviet Union and yet it was continually looked at as progress that was being made economically in that country.

Now as the world has begun to climb over the Iron Curtain through satellites and increased communications, when the Chinese leadership begins to murder only 3,000 of their own people, the world begins to understand what communism is all about. Freedom and tyranny cannot coexist. The next decade will tell whether or not democracy and opportunity will survive or whether the tyrannical brute of communism will continue to collapse. It is an exciting time for our Nation to continue to lead the world for peace and freedom and opportunity.

#### HISTORIC SAVINGS AND LOAN LEGISLATION REQUIRES COOPERATION

(Mr. BARNARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, next week we are going to be taking up a very historical bill as we have already discussed somewhat this morning, H.R. 1278, which is the FSLIC bill. I cannot impress the Members too much as to how important this bill is. This is a first reconstruction of the savings and loan industry since the early 1930's when we structured the Federal Home Loan Banking System, and this particular legislation needs all the attention and the consideration of every Member of the House.

I was delighted to hear this morning that the distinguished minority whip indicated that we are going to be deliberate in taking up this bill. Every day that we delay is costing us tens of millions of dollars as far as the savings and loan industry is concerned. I hope that the Members will take careful note of this legislation. I will be attentive to all the provisions of it, because it is one of the most important pieces of legislation, not only from the stand-



point of restructuring and making viable the savings and loan industry of this country, but also in providing a mechanism where we can guarantee the depositors who have put their money into the savings and loan industry of this country, that their moneys are safe, that their deposits are protected, and that the Home Loan Bank System will continue to operate.

This is going to be an historic week next week, as we take up this legislation. We need the attention and the consideration and the cooperation of every Member.

#### CHINESE GOVERNMENT CONDEMNATION

(Mr. LaFALCE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the Chinese Government brutally violated the human rights of tens of thousands of their own citizens. They continue to do so.

What extreme provocations drove them to these brutalities? The provocations included peaceful demonstrations demanding democratic reforms and an end to corruption. The provocations, Mr. Speaker, included the construction of a statue of liberty in the center of the square. The Chinese Government found these actions so offensive they sent in thousands of troops, guns blazing, to disperse the demonstrators.

On Monday, President Bush responded appropriately, for the time being. This week, Members of this House have added our condemnation of the past week's events. However, if the Chinese continue the killing and maiming of their own people, this Congress must work together to act. One step we can take is to ask the world to condemn the Chinese by refusing them loans from the World Bank.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, China gets almost \$2 billion from that institution. As a member of the Banking Committee, I believe all the civilized nations of the world should stand together in saying that these acts of repression will not be supported with financial resources from the industrialized democracies of the world.

#### FAIRNESS FOR U.S. SHIPBUILDING AND SHIP REPAIR INDUSTRIES

(Mr. PICKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, today, Ambassador Carla Hills will receive a petition from the U.S. Shipbuilders

Council, urging her to use her authority as the United States Trade Representative under section 301 of the Trade Act, to eliminate the substantial government subsidies that shipyards in West Germany, Japan, Korea, and other nations enjoy over their United States competitors.

I urge the administration to act favorably on this petition. Our Nation's shipbuilding and ship repair base has eroded dramatically in recent years. Since 1982, 76 domestic yards have closed their doors, sending thousands of skilled Americans into other occupations and crippling this Nation's ability to mobilize in time of war. More alarming still is the fact that there is not one single commercial vessel over 1,000 deadweight tons on order or under construction in any shipyard in the United States today.

This decline is not the result of fair competition, but the result of mounting government subsidies by nations with which we compete. Direct subsidies, preferential financing, and tax incentives from these nations to their domestic shipbuilders in recent years amount to billions of dollars.

The U.S. Government can no longer stand idly by as a disinterested bystander. These unfair foreign subsidies must be stopped or we will continue to see our shipbuilding and ship repair yards shrivel, and our mobilization base suffer.

#### THE GOVERNMENT'S GUARANTEE ON SAVINGS AND LOAN DEPOSITS

(Mrs. PATTERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, soon we will have an opportunity to consider President Bush's savings and loan bill.

For 50 years, millions of Americans have placed their money in savings and loans and banks relying on the Federal Government's promise that their money was safe under the umbrella of Federal deposit insurance. Senior citizens saving for their retirement, young couples trying to buy a house, and parents saving for their children's college education have relied on the Government's guarantee to protect them in the event the institution failed.

Next week, we will face the challenge of making good on that promise. We must make good on that promise. Millions of senior citizens, young couples, and parents are relying on us to pass a bill that keeps our pledge to them and ensures that this never, ever happens again.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE HAZARDOUS MATERIALS TRANSPORTATION AMENDMENTS OF 1989

(Mr. APPLEGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, today I am going to introduce the Hazardous Materials Transportation Amendments of 1989, in answer to the Hazardous Waste Act of 1974, which was never fully implemented.

Today I think everybody would be shocked if they knew that there were 500,000 shipments of toxic hazardous waste going through our communities each and every day of the year. That threatens these communities, it threatens the people in those communities, it threatens industries and businesses, and it poses a threat to the water we drink and the air we breathe. Emergency response teams, our firefighters, do not always know and cannot always find out what kind of chemicals have spilled from these wrecks, and it is very important that they have this information so they know exactly what they have to do to save these communities.

This legislation will strengthen that 1974 bill, and it will provide the response teams with the instant information that is necessary. It will not only save our communities, but it will save the countless numbers of brave and dedicated firefighters who have in the past lost their lives in these situations.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Members to join with me in this very important piece of legislation, which has been made a priority of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation, the gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA].

#### LOWER INTEREST RATES, REDUCED SPENDING HOLD KEY TO ECONOMIC IMPROVEMENT

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, the prime rate is currently about 8 percent higher in the United States than in Japan. Our interest rates are much higher than in most other developed nations. Some people think that those from other nations are far better at business than we are. However, I think it is amazing that American companies have been able to compete at all, starting with such a huge disadvantage in the rate of interest.

Yesterday we took up the FSX deal in the House. Many Members were concerned about the huge imbalance of trade between the United States and Japan. I am thankful that many foreign companies and many Japanese

companies have brought jobs to Tennessee. However, I would like to see some opportunities remain for Americans. We will continue to lose many of our best businesses and properties to foreign ownership unless we bring down our interest rates. These interest rates will not come down until the liberals in Washington stop voting for big spending, budget-busting bills.

High interest rates hurt the low- and middle-income people most of all buying homes, buying cars, and sending their children to college.

Mr. Speaker, we must bring down the spending here in Washington.

#### THE RECENT EVENTS IN CHINA

(Mr. VISCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply saddened by the violent and repressive actions taken by the Chinese military against those who have demonstrated for democratic reform.

On June 18, 1799, Thomas Jefferson wrote to a college student and said, "To preserve the freedom of the human mind \* \* \* and freedom of the press, every spirit should be ready to devote itself to martyrdom."

Removed in time from our own Revolution, we must stand in awe of those who have taken Jefferson's admonition literally. Who by their death, remind us of the treasure we possess.

The treasure is freedom, assumed as a birthright, but clearly a gift of past generations.

Ours is now the responsibility to sustain this freedom and to assert it. For as Jefferson also wrote, " \* \* \* as long as we may think as we will, and speak as we think the condition of man will proceed in improvement."

As events in China continue to unfold, let us use the talents and energy that have made this House the fundamental institution of democracy to counsel, encourage, and support those who aspire to bring freedom to China.

#### READ MY FSLIC: NO NEW TAXES?

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, in the last election, the President asked us to read his lips. "No New Taxes." Well, the Bush savings and loan bailout is the biggest tax increase in recent memory.

This cartoon actually severely underestimates the true cost to the taxpayer. The General Accounting Office has estimated that the taxpayer will pay a minimum of \$150 billion for the

bailout. To this must be added the \$8 billion in tax breaks from the December 1988 FSLIC deals plus \$42 billion more in interest costs on the money Treasury will borrow to finance the bailout. In effect, the taxpayer is being sent a bill of over \$200 billion over the next 30 years. To the average person in my State, this will mean about \$300 in additional taxes.

Yesterday, I presented an alternative to this tax bill to our colleagues on the Rules Committee. It is three times less expensive than the Bush plan and it cuts costs to the taxpayer by 300 percent. It prohibits long-term borrowing to pay for this. It requires the Congress and the President to fund the costs of the bailout annually on a pay-as-you-go basis. It prohibits the use of individual income taxes to pay for the bailout.

Congress and the President should negotiate and use a process similar to what was done on the recent budget agreement to make those who are responsible for this debacle pay for it.

I urge my colleagues on the Rules Committee and in the House to support my proposal to cut costs to the taxpayers and take the burden of the savings and loan bailout off the backs of the American taxpayer.

#### A SCENARIO FOR NEXT WEEK'S CONSIDERATION OF SAVINGS AND LOAN LEGISLATION

(Mr. GINGRICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I think the presentation by the gentlewoman was entirely appropriate, and I am glad she has introduced a bill and I am glad she is working on the savings and loan problem. But I do want to say, as we enter next week's discussion, that partisan Democrats who want to make partisan points about the savings and loan problem should be very, very cautious.

There is a book called "Honest Graft," there is a report by Mr. Phelan, and there are all sorts of things which are admissible in this House about how we got into the savings and loan mess and what the role of the House Democratic Party was. I am prepared to go through all of next week and say nothing about any of that, but if there is going to be any bashing of George Bush and any bashing of the Republican Party, I just want the Democrats to understand that we are fully prepared to talk about how the mess got so big and who was responsible. And I hope we will see no more cartoons of the President of the United States and we will see no more party partisanship if in fact the Democrats prefer to talk about the future and not talk about the past.

□ 1040

#### S&L BAILOUT BILL SHOULD BE IN THE TAXPAYER'S INTEREST

(Mr. BATES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, while some members in the House attempt to bail out the savings and loan industry, we should not stab the taxpayer in the back in the process.

That is why I will be supporting the on-budget treatment of the resolution funding corporation because it saves the American taxpayer \$4.8 billion and increases the industry contributions by \$640 million between fiscal years 1990 and 1994. Since we are dealing with a \$150 billion budget deficit, we should be taking steps to reduce the deficit, not expand it by using deceptive budgeting techniques.

I will be supporting an amendment to be offered by my colleague, Don PEASE of Ohio, which would limit deposit insurance up to \$100,000 on a per person or total deposit basis. No longer would a U.S. taxpayer be in the business of guaranteeing the savings of upper-income individuals and corporations whose deposits exceed \$100,000.

#### THE 43D ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE ITALIAN REPUBLIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives that June 2 marked the 43d anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Italy.

On June 2, 1946, the Italian people voted to replace their constitutional monarchy with a free democratic government. Eleven days after this referendum in support of democratic rule, King Umberto II left Italy, and within 1½ years after the vote, on January 1, 1948, the Italian Constitution was completed. This document embodied the principle that the "sovereignty belongs to the people who exercise it within the forms and limits of the Constitution." It proclaimed "the inviolable rights of man," and guaranteed "equal social dignity" for all citizens and equality before the law regardless of sex, religion, race, language, political opinions, or social condition.

With the aid of the Marshall plan and the unwavering commitment and resolve of the Italian people, during the last four decades, the growth of Italian industry has been unprecedented. Social and educational programs have expanded, and the arts and humanities have achieved a renewed prominence. In addition to her outstanding postwar achievement on the domestic front, Italy also has placed herself in the vanguard of European integration. As a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Italy has been and continues to



be a loyal Western ally, committed to the causes of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I take the opportunity to extend my greeting and best wishes to the people of the Italian Republic, as well as to the Italian Americans in my own 11th Congressional District of Illinois, which I am honored to represent, and throughout the country, who are joining in the 43d anniversary of the founding of the Republic of Italy.

I know that the friendship between Italy and the United States shall continue to flourish in the years ahead, and toward this end, I am very pleased to announce the President of the United States has extended an invitation to the President of Italy, Francesco Cossiga, to visit the United States. President Cossiga has accepted this invitation, and will be celebrating the Columbus Day holiday here in our country in October.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO SAM FREDMAN: STATE SUPREME COURT JUSTICE, COMMUNITY LEADER, AND FRIEND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a very great man. As a leader of the Democratic Party in New York, a lawyer, a father, and a grandfather, Mr. Samuel Fredman has commanded respect and admiration for his distinguished career of leadership and service from his colleagues, his family and the many friends he has won over the years. I feel very fortunate to count Sam among my very dearest friends and trusted advisers. On Wednesday, June 14, Sam will begin his service as a justice on the Supreme Court of New York, Ninth Judicial District. That is indeed a great honor. It is also the next logical step in a career based on the pursuit of justice and premised on serving the community.

Sam has been a member of the New York State Bar Association for 40 years. He graduated from Columbia Law School in 1948 and was admitted to the bar the following year. He has been a partner in the firm of Fink, Weinberger, Fredman, Berman, Lowell & Fensterheim.

Fortunately, Sam did not limit his legal training only to his successful law practice. Sam has dedicated himself and his expertise to Westchester County and its people. He has been a leader in our local Democratic Party. In the 1960's, he served as chairman of the White Plains Democratic City Committee. He also served as the chairman of the Westchester County Democratic Committee from 1975 to 1979, and as a member of the Executive Committee of the New York State Democratic Committee from 1976 to 1980.

As a member of the Westchester County Charter Revision Commission beginning in 1986, and as its vice chairman beginning in 1987, Sam has given his time and his legal expertise to Westchester County. He believes in good government and he has put that commitment to good work on this important commission.

Sam's dedication to the community has not been purely political nor legal in nature. He has participated in numerous charitable fund drives, which include efforts for the White Plains Hospital, Community Chest, and the Heart Fund, as well as numerous other charities. He has also served as a member of the White Plains Commission on Human Rights.

He has also been active in working with many Westchester residents directly to better their lives. He coached boys baseball and basketball teams for the White Plains Recreational Department for 5 years. He has served as a leader in the Westchester County Jewish community.

To no one's surprise, Sam has received numerous awards and honors over the last 25 years, including this year when he was awarded the distinguished service award from the State University of New York.

In any discussion of Sam's long and illustrious career, his distinguished service to our country must be remembered. Sam served from 1943 to 1946 in the U.S. Army Air Force, including the Far Eastern Theater—Philippines and Japan—as technical sergeant from 1945 to 1946.

Sam Fredman has been a dedicated professional and community leader for many, many years. I am also most grateful that he has been my very good friend. I have long relied on Sam's judgment and counsel. As I weighed seeking the seat in Congress that I am privileged to hold today, his encouragement was a very important factor in my decision.

Next week, when Sam becomes State supreme court justice, New York's legal system will be gaining a man of great integrity, fairness and honor. I know that he will serve with the same commitment that he has shown throughout his career. I want all of my colleagues here in the House to know how fortunate this Nation is to be gaining a judge of Sam Fredman's caliber and principle.

#### RESTORING CONFIDENCE IN THE POLITICAL PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker and Members, the last 2 weeks have been anything but normal here in the Congress of the United States. For the last year business has not been as usual as we have been battered by the press, by public opinion, and sometimes even by ourselves as we try to determine really what we are as an institution and really where we want to go.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the next hour, or beyond if necessary, is that we take all of what has happened in the past and we recognize that it is time we unite in a bipartisan way to try to rebuild this institution and try to put back together a Congress that we can be proud of, a Congress that the American people can be proud of, and, frankly, a Congress that the entire world can be proud of. As we do that, I would suggest to my colleagues that there are four spheres of reform

that we ought to all imprint upon our minds and upon our discussions so that, as we go forth, we are able to really analyze what we can do as a body politic to restore the confidence of the American people in this institution which yet today still is that greatest of all deliberative bodies.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest those four spheres are as follows: No. 1, we need to reform the process by which we elect people to Congress, and that of course means campaign reform; No. 2, we need to reform the standards of conduct for those who have been given this public trust of serving as a Member of Congress; No. 3, we need to reform the process by which we make our laws, that obviously being rules reform; and, No. 4, let us not forget that there are many, many different policies begging for reform, and that really means that whether we are Democrat or Republican it is time we try to establish and create an agenda worth voting for, a response of real solutions to the real problems of real people across this country.

Let us take a little bit of time, if we can, to look at each of these four areas, and let us begin with the whole area of campaign reform because it is one of those two areas that has become most popular in recent weeks and months. It is one of the two areas in which the Speaker and the Republican leader jointly announced bipartisan task forces—six Republicans, six Democrats—to try to resolve in a bipartisan way suggestions and policy changes which can be brought to the Congress for consideration by the full House and obviously put into practice either through our rules or, in many cases, through changes in actual law here in this country. A number of different issues can be discussed when one talks about campaign reform, but I think we ought to do so under one broad general concept, and that is: It is time to return the elections in this country to the people, and we can start by simply recognizing that the American people do not participate in the American election process anymore.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is we have the second lowest voter turnout of any democracy in the world, and, if my colleagues will look at the 1988 election turnout and if they will skip the Presidential to just look at the last parliamentary election anywhere in the world, that being our 1986 turnout compared with other countries' most recent election, we have the dubious distinction of having the lowest turnout.

Now why do we have the lowest turnout? That is because the election process in this country has been one controlled by incumbency and special interests, and the American people simply look at all the tools used by in-

cumbents to enhance and protect their advantage when they go the polls throughout the entire 2-year preceding term of office, and they look at the power and influence of special-interest group money in funding those elections and in otherwise contributing toward the decisionmaking process, and they quickly recognize that, as a general citizen, unless they have been a full participant in a special interest group process, there simply is no rhyme or reason for them to participate because the destiny has already been marked by others.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to my colleagues that there are a whole host of different options in the area of campaign reform that ought to be considered, and our Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] has really set out the whole cause of this discussion as he sent a letter that has been made public to President Bush in requesting that, as the President comes forth with his campaign reform proposal, that he will take into mind these 21 different elements that the Republican leader has suggested.

Now, as we do that, let us begin, however, by really taking a look at some of the major issues that I think everyone agrees become all that important as we try to make these particular changes.

First and foremost, if we are going to change the process of campaigns, we need to change the grandfather clause which allows Members elected before 1980 to use their campaign funds as, frankly, a bank account which can be converted to their personal use at some later date when they leave the Congress. It is no secret that we have many Members of Congress of both political parties who have campaign treasury accounts far above and beyond anything which would be necessary for their reelection process. Many of them, to be honest, come from what are at least today very solid one-party districts, and the potential for that money to be converted from a donation to a public election process into personal use questions the integrity of us as an institution, and certainly is allowed to build up and eliminate any potential for competitiveness in that particular race.

□ 1050

There are 191 current House Members who have stockpiled over \$39 million in campaign funds that could be converted to their retirement programs upon their retirement from the Congress.

I doubt that it was the intent of any individual American and I doubt if frankly it was the intent of any Political Action Committee that when they donated to that particular campaign they thought the money would even-

tually go toward a personal retirement.

The fact is that we have had Members of Congress thus far retire and convert over \$862,000 from campaign funds into personal use.

Now, a second issue which I think becomes even more important to returning the American election to the American people is to begin that process of eliminating the power of incumbency. There are two different ways, obviously, to do that. One is frank mail. The second is to eliminate the carryover funds.

The fact is any Member of Congress' Campaign Committee that has a surplus can carry all those funds over to the next elections.

Now, assume that you are a challenger or you are considering running for Congress, the fact is that the person who is in Congress has \$250,000 in their campaign treasury in January 1989 before the 1990 election, and they have not even begun the fundraising process. Consider for yourself the automatic handicap of name identification, public prestige, or recognition by the press in your district, of invitations to speak and all those other elements which come with normal incumbency, add to that the cash advantage of \$250,000 or more before you even begin the process, and you begin to recognize what I am talking about.

Members of the 101st Congress have amassed record surpluses of campaign cash in 1988, totaling more than \$94 million. Think of that. The incumbents of this Congress have \$94 million for their 1990 reelection campaigns before the campaigns have even started.

Now, if you were considering running for this Congress of the United States against an incumbent with those kind of odds, I think you can quickly get a handle on what we are talking about.

On the average, a Representative has more than \$146,000 in their campaign funds, and Senators on the average have over \$305,000.

The 10 largest campaign war chests held by Members of the House of Representatives averaged over \$800,000.

Now, the second area in terms of eliminating the advantages of incumbency that I suggested when we talk about the whole concept of campaign reform has to be the use of frank mail. The reality is that we as Members of Congress have the opportunity through the frank mail of really running a 2-year campaign period to the constituents of our district.

Now, I am not for banning frank mail. We ought to be able to respond to the letters that come into us from our constituents. We ought to be able to do the proper notice of how we feel about particular issues, announcing those issues in statements that are important to us through press releases.

We ought to be able to announce to our district the whole concept of when we are to hold a town meeting or hold office hours so that they can come and talk to us with their problems and concerns, but that is not what we are talking about when we suggest that it is time to reduce frank mail. We are talking about the fact that in 1988 we spent \$82 million, which was more than twice the 1975 appropriation, and get this. In 1986, Congress disbursed more than 12,000 items of mail for every incoming letter. Think of that. For every letter that came in here, 12,000 went out from Members of Congress. You quickly begin to understand the power of the incumbency that exists in this area. Obviously, we are going to have to begin to look at this whole question of PAC's to either eliminate, or as the President has suggested, to reduce totally the PAC contributions directly, and particularly to reduce what we call the soft money. That is all the indirect efforts by political action committees and special interests to indirectly fund and influence elections in this country.

PAC funds raised by candidates for congressional seats have ballooned from \$34 million in the 1977-78 election cycle to \$133 million in the 1985-86 cycle.

Congress, frankly, is addicted to political action committees. Senators get about one-third of their reelection money from PAC's. House Members last year realized 37 percent of their campaign receipts from PAC's. The Republicans received 37 percent. Democrats received 46 percent of their money from political action committees.

In the first 15 months of the 1987-88 election cycle, that one which we just completed, PAC's gave \$53 million to House and Senate candidates, an increase of 26 percent from the same period 2 years earlier. The increase was 16 percent for Senate candidates and 33 percent for House candidates.

Now, it is no secret to tell anybody that incumbents are the beneficiaries of PAC's, and PAC's do not even make their decisions anymore based on your voting record. Frankly, in too many cases, the political action committee money is simply purchasing access to that particular Member of Congress, his office and staff, rather than actually rewarding someone of a like philosophy in the normal give-and-take of politics.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. GUNDERSON. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague and friend, the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. I just would like to reiterate some of the things the gentleman suggested here and add my support to many of them and some com-



ments with regard to campaign reform. I think the gentleman's comments are right on the mark.

I would hope that as our new Speaker suggested the other day that we will see a reform package come in this session of Congress. I think it is very wise to have a bipartisan panel, six Republicans and six Democrats.

Is the gentleman a member of that panel?

Mr. GUNDERSON. Yes, I am a member of it.

Mr. UPTON. I will be very interested, certainly as a Member of this institution, but as an American, to look at campaign reform. I would hope that some of the suggestions of the gentleman, almost all his suggestions that he made, will be included as part of a package so that we will see that in the future no longer will 99 percent of those incumbents who run for office become reelected.

You know, there have been a number of statistics that have come out the last year with the election in November, 99 percent of us getting reelected. I believe only about six Members actually lost in the general election to the other party.

Mr. GUNDERSON. The reality is, if I can interrupt the gentleman at that point, in the last session of Congress, the 100th Congress, five Members died, six Members were defeated for reelection.

Mr. UPTON. So we had an equal chance of dying—

Mr. GUNDERSON. As getting defeated.

Mr. UPTON. I am glad we are both young; but that is the point. I mean, that is not the way it ought to be. Campaigns ought to be decided upon issues in the districts that they represent, and not just because someone is an incumbent versus a challenger.

The gentleman's comments about the grandfather clause, the gentleman is right. Now only 191 Members of this institution, 434 Members today, were elected prior to 1980. They are entitled to keep all of the money that they have not spent on their campaigns for personal use, once they retire.

Well, we have a majority now, 191, we are over 200 in terms of those—55 percent of us now were elected since 1980. You would think now that we could have the votes to get this as part of a package, beginning very early today I wish, although we are out of session for legislative votes, so it is going to have to be beginning next week at the earliest, so we can eliminate the grandfather clause so that those dollars can be either returned to the Treasury or to charity or perhaps to the individuals who contributed those dollars. In fact, the Members of Congress would not have the opportunity to personally profit from perhaps hundreds of thousands of dollars that he or she has in their campaign ac-

counts. I would hope that the grandfather clause would be removed in whatever package comes up.

□ 1100

The second thing that the gentleman mentioned, of course, was frank mail. It is outrageous, I think, and I just went through my first reelection cycle last November.

Of course, we have a restriction on sending out our newsletters, and I believe it is 60 days prior to an election. I park in the Cannon Garage, my office is in Longworth, and there is a long tunnel in between. Every day 60 days prior to that election in November, there were people's newsletters stacked up all the way out almost into the parking lot so that they can hit that 60-day mark right on the nose so their district would be flooded with newsletters, "newsletters," just prior to the election to get the last bang out of the frank mail process. That is wrong, and I would like to see a couple of big reforms with regard to newsletters.

First, if we do not have it 60 days, let us look at 90 or 120 days.

Mr. GUNDERSON. The bipartisan Task Force on Campaign Reform that is meeting as preparation for that, the six Republicans are meeting, and the six Democrats are meeting, separately to try to determine what their agendas and proposals might be. I think the gentleman would be pleased to know, and I do not think I am speaking out of order in indicating that one of the proposals that the Republicans are looking at seriously is the whole concept as to whether we should even eliminate postal patronage in an election year. If we want to use it as part of the normal conduct of business in a nonelection year, questionnaires, meeting notices, et cetera, fine, but when we recognize that in this Nation of ours where in Illinois they have to file in December the preceding year for election, and we have spring primaries, I think from February on throughout the rest of the year, probably in that election year Members ought to respond to constituent mail, but they ought not even be using the postal patronage.

Mr. UPTON. I think that is a very good point. Furthermore, I must say that in the random checking that I have done with other Members of Congress who had the right to send out a maximum of six newsletters, most of us do not do that. I think last year I sent either three or four questionnaires, three newsletters with perhaps one questionnaire. I would like to see the number reduced from six to either three or four. I think that that would make quite a bit more sense and, in fact, we could save the taxpayers quite a bit of money in that 12,000 letters that we send out every year,

per letter that we receive, obviously it would be reduced.

The other comment that the gentleman mentioned was with PAC's, special-interest money perhaps one would call it. There are some major reforms that I think we can make in PAC's, and I see my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], is here. Of course, he is on the Committee on House Administration, and one of my first areas where I testified as a freshman in Congress 2 years ago was before his subcommittee, where we talked about PAC reform.

I have a very unique policy myself with regard to PAC money. I have a percentage that I instituted. No more than 50 percent of my funds come from PAC's. In fact, it was about 27 percent in both the last two elections that I had, but in addition, I only accept PAC dollars from those PAC's that have an economic tie to my district.

That is very hard for perhaps 435 other Members to institute the Upton PAC policy, although I think that it works for me, but there are some things that we can do. I think we ought to reduce the maximum of money, of PAC dollars, that we can receive. Right now it is technically \$10,000 we can receive from any PAC that one might choose. I think we ought to reduce that to maybe \$2,500.

Instead of having some Members of Congress, and the gentleman gave the average, and I think he indicated the percentages.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Democrats received 46 percent of their money from PAC's. Republicans, 37 percent.

Mr. UPTON. Some are higher, and some are 80 or 90 percent. I would like to see that reduced, not only to 50 percent, but maybe 40 percent.

Let me just make one other comment, and I will yield back.

As we talk about incumbency, carry-over funds, one idea that might be a virtue here is that it can be no PAC contributions for the first year. We have 2-year election cycles, and we do not know who our opponents are, yet many of us have already had fundraisers, and we are already calling on PAC's to help us, many of us. Let us make it no PAC contributions the first year, so that the second year the PAC groups are going to be able to determine, "Well, so-and-so has a bad record," or whatever. That might be a very good stand to take and, thus, further restrict PAC donations, and the factors that people decide when they run for office, how much money does the incumbent have to make that decision.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUNDERSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to know where to begin when one talks about campaign reform and my involvement. As some of the Members may know, I have a nine-page Dear Colleague that has gone out to the Members, and that may be a Guinness Book of World Records on length of a Dear Colleague, and that contains 38 separate bills.

What I have tried to do in the listening to suggested changes, instead of listing a comprehensive package of what I believed I thought ought to be reality, I tried to offer a number of choices to Members in this whole area of campaign reform. I think it behooves us to take a step back and ask ourselves: What are the really critical fundamental questions, and what are not? And in the discussion about PAC dollars, one of the things I think that people have to understand and appreciate is that there are going to be political dollars involved in the system, and if we make changes which are either silly or are done for purposes of political expediency, all we are doing is rerouting the dollars and, as a matter of fact, I would like to take a step farther back when we talk about money.

One of the major thrusts is that there is simply too much money in the system, first of all, and then, secondly, there is a concern about where that too much money comes from. I think if we focus on the purpose of money, we begin to realize that some people have lost sight of the means and the end, and that money really is simply a means, it is not an end.

The whole purpose of the election process is to get more votes than the other person. That is how we win. People believe fairly fundamentally that the person who spends more money is the one who has a better chance of winning. That is generally true in today's political climate because of the way in which the money relationship has been established.

There is nothing absolute about a candidate's relationship to the money that they receive, and the gentleman's voluntary structuring, I would say to the gentleman from Michigan, unbeknownst to me, was a concept which I have developed into a piece of legislation which I think fundamentally alters that relationship between a candidate and the money.

What do I mean by that? If money is the means and votes are the end, one of the things that has occurred, especially over this decade and really had its roots in the 1970's, was a separation of the means and the ends. What I mean by that is that candidates more and more looked away from their district for the financial resources to get elected. They came back to Washing-

ton. Even incumbent Members hold their PAC fundraisers in Washington. Very few of us have a district that we tend to go back to for fundraisers except for publicity purposes. The money tends to come from the outside more and more of the district rather than from inside the district. I think that is unhealthy.

The counterargument from those who see the money coming from sources outside the district say that that is at least the appearance of corruption, and what we have to do is go public financing or to limit the flow of the money under that structure.

I think we ought to go far more fundamental than that and change the structure, and just as constitutionally we are able to limit the amount that an individual can give, I think we ought to seriously entertain the idea that we require a candidate to get a majority of their money from the district that they are trying to get elected from, not on a voluntary basis as the gentleman has done, and I think correctly so, but as a matter of ongoing ordinary political practice.

What does that do? First of all, it forces the individual to focus on their district in a different way. This is not just the seedbed for votes from which one takes outside dollars and pours them into their district to try to get the votes to go their way, but it is returning back to the business of tying the means and the end, the dollar and the vote, more closely together, and I think that is healthy.

I do not think there is anything wrong with having to go to someone and ask them for their vote and, at the same time, ask them for a contribution. If they choose not to give one the contribution, chances are they are not going to give one their vote, and then it is not the thousand-dollar PAC contribution that is important, because one gets no votes with the thousand-dollar PAC contribution, but they get the wherewithal to try to buy some votes in their district, and they are out there campaigning trying to meet as many people as possible, because each person they meet that tends to give them the vote will tend to give them a dollar, \$5, \$10. Amounts that are totally meaningless now in our campaign structure become important, because if the person is willing to give them \$10 of their own money, more than likely they will also have their vote, so every time they collect a contribution, they collect a vote. It is almost one-to-one relationship between the means and the end, and I think that is more a return back to the kind of campaigning that most people want.

What they want is to see the candidate in the district working with the people who actually make the decision, the voters, and also relying more heavily on them for their financial support. We do not need nearly as

much money under that system. Rather than an arbitrary limit of some dollar amount, and we have seen legislation that suggests a \$200,000 limit or \$300,000 limit, which may be appropriate in one district and not appropriate in another, I think it is far more realistic to allow the district itself to determine what the campaign level is going to be in terms of finances: local control of campaign finances. One cannot take a dollar outside the district unless they have been able to raise a dollar inside the district. That makes the person back home feel that they are important once again, that they are not just being used as vote fodder, that they are a meaningful part of the election.

I think as we look at this area of campaign reform, what we have to do is understand that the relationships that we have established we established statutorily. We did not establish it because that is the way the world is.

□ 1110

The world is that way because we structured it that way and we can alter that structure. I think a very healthy altering, a beneficial altering is to begin to focus on public financing? No. District financing? Yes.

Local control is, I think, one of the ways out of our current dilemma.

Mr. UPTON. If I may take some time from the gentleman from Wisconsin, I have a copy here of the eight-page memo, I guess you could say, or questionnaire for us to study. Now I do not know, but would the gentleman object if we entered this into the RECORD?

Mr. THOMAS of California. Not at all.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's questionnaire be inserted into the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

#### CAMPAIGN REFORM PROPOSALS

1A. The following bills limit the election advantages now held by incumbents.

Choices among seven bills to limit franking.

□ H.R. — (No. 1) A total ban on unsolicited franked mail.

This bill would allow Members of Congress to respond to communications from their constituents, but not to send out unsolicited mail at taxpayer expense. It would save the vast proportion of the \$113 million that Congress spent in 1988 on official postage, plus additional amounts for printing and handling.

Or □ H.R. — (No. 2) A ban on franked mass mailings of over 500 pieces.

This bill would ban postal patron mailings to every person in the district and also close a loophole through which Members might make up for such a ban using computer generated letters addressed to nearly every



voter based on geographical or interest sub-groupings.

Or □ H.R. — (No. 3) A ban on postal patron mailings.

This bill prohibits the district-wide postal patron mailing including newsletters, now limited to 6 per Member, and district-wide meeting notices, not limited under current law.

Or □ H.R. — (No. 4) A limit of one postal patron mailing per year, mailed in December, January, or February only.

This would allow for a regular survey or newsletter, but would substantially limit campaigning at taxpayer expense.

Or □ H.R. — (No. 5) A cut of 50 percent in funds appropriated for franking with funds divided evenly between House and Senate and evenly within the Houses among Members.

This would save over \$88 million per election cycle or 50 percent of the \$177 million spent on postage by Congress in 1987 and 1988.

Or □ H.R. — (No. 6) A limit of 1 million pieces of franked mail per Member for the two year election cycle.

A postal patron mailing averages about 250,000 pieces. This allows for two such mailings plus well over 500 pieces of mail per day over a two year period. The House currently mails over 2 million pieces of mail per member per election cycle.

Or □ H.R. — (No. 7) Quarterly disclosure of the cost of franked mail for each House Member's office.

Four bills limiting the use of excess campaign funds.

Or □ H.R. — (No. 8) To return excess campaign funds to the Treasury.

This bill would require all Members of Congress to return unused campaign funds after each general election to the U.S. Treasury for the purpose of reducing the national debt. Members would be allowed to retain \$.10 per district voter. Incumbents and challengers would therefore start each new election cycle on a more even footing.

Or □ H.R. — (No. 9) To prohibit Members, effective immediately, from converting their excess campaign funds to personal use upon retirement.

This bill would repeal the legislative provision popularly known as the "grandfather clause" which allows Members elected prior to 1980 to convert excess campaign funds to personal use upon retirement. The bill would take effect immediately.

Or □ H.R. — (No. 10) To prohibit Members, effective January 1, 1991, from converting their excess campaign funds to personal use upon retirement.

Ends the "grandfather clause" as in H.R. — (No. 9), but does not take effect until January 1, 1991.

Or □ H.R. — (No. 11) To prohibit Members, effective January 1, 1993, from converting their excess campaign funds to personal use upon retirement.

Ends the "grandfather clause" as in H.R. — (No. 9), but does not take effect until Jan. 1, 1993. (Allows 1992 retirement in conjunction with reapportionment)

Three bills to limit incumbent fundraising advantages.

□ H.R. — (No. 12) Prohibits transfers among candidate committees or PACs and limits candidates and incumbents to a single committee.

This legislation would ban so-called leadership committees which allow well financed incumbents to donate funds often raised from special interests to other incumbents or candidates. It also prohibits PACs from laundering funds through other PACs.

□ H.R. — (No. 13) Prohibits unopposed incumbent fundraising in non-election years.

This legislation prohibits incumbent fundraising from November 15 after an election until the November 15 one year prior to his or her next election. Should a challenger begin fundraising before November 15, the incumbent would be free to fundraise as well. This bill would limit the substantial time advantage most incumbents have over challengers and encourage Members to spend their time legislating and not fundraising.

□ H.R. — (No. 14) Prohibits fundraising within the Washington, D.C. Beltway.

This legislation makes a symbolic point but could have a significant impact on fundraising. The "Washington fundraiser" would be banned under this legislation. Members could risk embarrassment and ridicule by holding fundraisers just outside the I-495 line, or spend more time in their districts raising money from voters instead of Washington special interests.

1B. The following bills improve the competitiveness of challenger candidates.

Three bills to strengthen a party's ability to help challengers.

□ H.R. — (No. 15) Allows a party to offset election benefit received by incumbents from taxpayer funds.

Allows a party to donate to challengers above current limits an additional amount set by the Clerk of the House that is determined to be a sum equal to the re-election value received by incumbents from their office, official salary, and franking expenditures.

This bill makes the point that we already have public financing, but only for incumbents. It underscores the need for a "level playing field" which allows challengers to have a real chance and voters a real choice.

□ H.R. — (No. 16) Allows a party to provide consulting services to candidates in addition to existing limits on party assistance.

This is a relatively simple way to provide high-quality professional assistance to candidates so the dollars they raise can be effectively spent. Many challengers fail as much for lack of expertise as for lack of funds.

□ H.R. — (No. 17) Allows a party to match donations to candidates of \$200 or less.

This bill encourages candidates to raise funds from small donors while providing another way for the party to assist deserving challengers who have demonstrated grassroots support.

Four bills to reduce campaign costs for all candidates.

□ H.R. — (No. 18) Allows candidates to use nonprofit postage rate now reserved only for political parties.

The nonprofit postage rate is significantly lower than the normal bulk mail rate. Postage rates are a major element of campaign costs. Allowing challengers to achieve a minimum level of campaign visibility helps challengers with their limited resources more than it does incumbents.

□ H.R. — (No. 19) Requires broadcast media to make free time available to general election Congressional candidates.

This bill would require each radio and television station to provide 30 minutes of free air time to each Congressional candidate within their area. Such time would be divided equally among 5 minute, 60 second and 30 second blocks in prime time the month prior to the election. Broadcast media are licensed to use the public airwaves and currently required to provide free time under the so-called fairness doctrine. The metro-

politan stations with multiple Congressional districts in their area are also those who receive the greatest benefit from their government licenses.

□ H.R. — (No. 20) Requires broadcast media to make free time available for debates between candidates for Congress.

This bill would require each radio and television station to provide 30 minutes of free air time for the purpose of broadcasting a debate among candidates for Congress in each Congressional District within their area. Only candidates whose party had received 10 percent or more of the vote for Congress in the prior election or had obtained the signatures of 5 percent of the voters in the District would be eligible to participate.

□ H.R. — (No. 21) Requires that broadcast media sell non-preemptable time to political candidates at 50 percent of the commercial rate for that time period.

2. The following bills limit the influence of special interests on congressional elections.

Three bills to limit PACs.

□ H.R. — (No. 22) Prohibits contributions to candidates by PACs that use corporate or union resources for operating expenses.

Federal election law prohibits the donation of corporate or union funds to Federal candidates. But corporate and union special interests still spend millions of dollars fundraising for and administering PACs. Automatic payroll deduction way in which funds which cannot be legally given to a candidate exert a disproportionate influence on our elections process.

President Bush has called for a ban on PAC contributions to candidates. His rationale applies most especially to PACs which pay for expenses from funds which do not meet Federal campaign contribution standards.

□ H.R. — (No. 23) Limits all PAC contributions to \$1,000, the limit for contributions from individuals. The current PAC limit is \$5,000.

Large special interest contributions from any source are not healthy for our political process.

Or □ H.R. — (No. 24) Limits all PAC contributions to \$2,500.

A bill to ban so-called "Bundling."

□ H.R. — (No. 25) Prohibits a single individual or employees of the same entity from both soliciting and having custody of more than one campaign contribution to a candidate during the entire course of the campaign.

Bundling of multiple campaign contributions to candidates is a frequent practice used by special interests to circumvent Federal contribution limits.

A bill to ban so-called "Soft Money."

□ H.R. — (No. 26) Prohibits national parties from raising or spending funds not subject to Federal contribution limits.

National parties currently can accept corporate, union, and personal funds in unlimited amounts for so-called "building funds" and "state and local accounts" which in reality cover party overhead expenses and indirectly assist Federal candidates. These are exactly the funds that the original Federal election laws were designed to control. The original intent of these laws should not be circumvented through the use of the "soft money" loophole.

Two bills to increase the influence of small donors from a candidate's local district.

□ H.R. — (No. 27) Requires that a majority of a candidate's funds come from individuals residing in the candidate's district.

This bill would promote local control of campaign finance. It would strengthen the connection between the voters in a candidate's district and the outcome of the election. Too often the election is decided by money from outside the district, rather than by voters and resources from inside the district.

□ H.R. — (No. 28) Allows political parties to match individual contributions up to \$250 from individuals residing in the candidate's district.

This bill would provide an incentive for candidates to raise money from individuals in the district rather than from special interests in Washington D.C. It would also strengthen parties' ability to help challengers with demonstrated local support.

Three bills to strengthen political parties' ability to raise funds independently from special interests.

□ H.R. — (No. 29) Allows local parties to raise and spend funds independent of state and national party limits.

This bill strengthens the ability of local parties to raise and spend funds in support of Federal candidates. Local parties should be encouraged to develop contribution and volunteer resources at the grassroots level.

□ H.R. — (No. 30) Allows voluntary party donation add-on on Federal tax returns.

This bill would allow every Federal taxpayer the opportunity, by checking a box on his or her income tax return, to make a voluntary contribution to the party of his or her choice. Without using taxpayer funds it would encourage taxpayers to participate in the elections process at a time when their interest in cost-effective government is at its peak.

□ H.R. — (No. 31) Replace the Federal subsidy of National party conventions with a \$1 voluntary party tax credit check-off.

This bill would replace a Federal subsidy for party extravaganzas with an incentive for ordinary taxpayers to support the party of their choice. Funds thus raised would be available to support challenger candidates and replace party funds lost by limits on PAC and soft money contributions.

3. The following bills ensure that all funds spent for the purpose of influencing of a Federal election are fully and promptly disclosed.

Six bills to close campaign reporting loopholes.

□ H.R. — (No. 32) To set a 24 hour deadline for reporting "late" contributions.

This bill would require contributions received within 10 days of an election to be reported within 24 hours of receipt by telegram, express mail, FAX or similar means.

□ H.R. — (No. 33) To require disclosure of all Federal, State, and local party funds used to influence a Federal election.

This bill would require all party committees to report to the FEC funds spent for party building, voter registration and get-out-the-vote activities.

□ H.R. — (No. 34) To require disclosure of all union and corporate member communication, voter registration, and get-out-the-vote activities.

This bill would require unions and corporations to disclose the sums they now spend to influence political campaigns that escape scrutiny under current law.

□ H.R. — (No. 35) To require disclosure of all candidate related voter education expenditures and all voter registration expenditures by nonprofit entities.

Nonprofit organizations spend large sums of non-disclosed funds on technically neutral candidate education programs and voter registration activities that can have a significant impact on Federal elections. Although there are Constitutional barriers to complete disclosure of all aspects of a nonprofit organization's activity, some disclosure is certainly warranted.

□ H.R. — (No. 36) To require disclosure of PAC overhead and director conflict of interest.

This bill would require PACs to report to their donors on funds spent for fundraising and overhead as well as on any conflict of interest of directors who also receive payments from, have contracts with, or benefit financially in any other way from the expenditures of the PAC.

□ H.R. — (No. 37) To allow the FEC to reinstate random audits of political campaigns.

Under pressure from Members of Congress, the FEC stopped conducting random audits of campaigns several years ago. Those audits, while burdensome to those involved, were an important deterrent to improper campaign practices, and should be reinstated.

4. The following bill ensures that elections for Congress are held in districts that are not distorted by partisan gerrymandering

A bill to set national standards for fair redistricting.

□ H.R. — (No. 38) To require that Congressional districts maintain community integrity, compactness, and contiguity, and that public access is protected during the redistricting process.

This bill would require that local counties and cities not be unnecessarily divided by a state redistricting plan and that districts be reasonably compact and contiguous. It also requires that information used to prepare the plan be available to the public and that the plan be available in advance for public inspection.

To indicate which bills you would like to cosponsor, you may return this summary sheet to House Subcommittee on Elections, H330, The Capitol.

#### LIMIT INCUMBENT FRANKED MAIL

- 1. Ban unsolicited franked mail.
- Or — 2. Ban franked mass mailings.
- Or — 3. Ban on postal patron mail.
- Or — 4. Limit of 1 postal patron mailing per year.
- Or — 5. 50 percent cut in franking funds.
- Or — 6. 1 million piece franking limit per election cycle.
- 7. Disclose Member franking cost.

#### LIMIT EXCESS CAMPAIGN FUNDS

- 8. Return excess campaign funds after each election.
- 9. End grandfather clause now.
- Or — 10. End grandfather clause '91.
- Or — 11. End grandfather clause '93.

#### LIMIT INCUMBENT FUNDRAISING

- 12. Ban transfers among PACs and candidate committees.
- 13. Ban unopposed incumbent fundraising in non-election years.
- 14. Ban fundraising inside the Beltway.

#### EXPAND PARTY CONTRIBUTIONS

- 15. Challenger can get party funds to offset incumbent taxpayer benefit.
- 16. Party consulting exempt from limits on contributions to candidates.
- 17. Party can match donations up to \$200 to candidates.

#### REDUCE CAMPAIGN COSTS

- 18. Candidates can use nonprofit postage rates.
- 19. One-half hr. of free media time per station per candidate.
- 20. Free media time for candidate debates.
- 21. 50 percent media rate cut for candidates.

#### LIMIT PACS

- 22. No contributions to candidates by PACs that use union/corporate resources.
- 23. \$1,000 PAC contribution limit.
- Or — 24. \$2,500 PAC contribution limit.

#### BAN BUNDLING/SOFT MONEY

- 25. Ban bundling.
- 26. Ban soft money to national parties.

#### ENCOURAGE SMALL/LOCAL DONORS

- 27. Majority of funds must be raised in district.
- 28. Parties can match individual donations of up to \$250 from within the district.

#### STRENGTHEN PARTY FUNDRAISING

- 29. Local party independent from state/national party limits.
- 30. Voluntary party donation add-on for tax returns.
- 31. Voluntary \$1 party checkoff tax-credit.

#### FULL DISCLOSURE

- 32. 24 hr. reporting deadline for late contributions.
- 33. Disclose all national, state and local party funds.
- 34. Disclose all union/corporate political activity.
- 35. Disclose all non-profit candidate and voter registration related spending.
- 36. Disclose PAC overhead and director conflict of interest.
- 37. Allow FEC random audits.

#### FAIR REDISTRICTING

- 38. National redistricting standards.
- If you have any additional campaign reform ideas, please note here or on back of page.

I would like to cosponsor the legislation indicated above.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Member \_\_\_\_\_

Mr. UPTON. I can tell you this was a very important piece in my office the last couple of weeks as we began to look at this. I sat down with my staff and we had about a 2-hour discussion.

We went through every one of the gentleman's items, "Fred, where do you stand? Where do you think we can make some improvements?"

We are looking to introduce my own bill and taking some of the substance from the gentleman from California, some of what I have done in my past with my own voluntary PAC contribution. On of the things we looked at is: let us focus on making sure that the district that one represents in this body sends that individual and funds that individual to get here in the first place.



I indicated before I think we ought to have a maximum amount of dollars that come from PAC's to one's campaign. Forty percent is where I am today.

But what I would also like to see, sort of extending what the gentleman from California indicated, is that that remaining 60 percent, and maybe larger, hopefully it will be, from individuals, let us make sure that 75 percent of those dollars in that remaining part of the pie come from that person's district. That of course under the Federal Election Commission rules that we have today, we have to identify someone's residence and place of occupation for contributions of more than \$200 and it would be very easy to determine that in fact 75 percent of the individual contributions came from that person's district.

Mr. THOMAS of California. One of my concerns, and I look forward to some of the concepts that the gentleman is pursuing, is trying not to make it mechanical; 20 percent of this, 30 percent of that, 40 percent of this, 75 percent of that. What I am trying to do is to create a system which will comfortably fit over 435 very diverse geographic and populated districts.

It seems to me there are two areas which have not been fully utilized in our political system recently. One obviously is the political parties. I am fond of saying "unshackle" the parties.

For example, a new and creative way to do that would be to, if you do get local contributions of under \$250, let us say, why could not the political party, the national political party, match that money? You have to raise it locally first and then the party can assist.

What I am trying to do is in picking, admittedly, an arbitrary number like a majority, is to try to change the direction of contact of candidates. The reason they come to Washington and the reason they stay in Washington is because that is the current money system. If you want to get them back in the district, if you want to force them to have a 1-to-1 relationship with the people who are actually going to participate in the voting in the election, then you can change the money system and you will tell them, "Go back home to get your money."

Now what is that going to do? It is going to require PAC's to alter their form to the new form of financing. No longer will it be quite such that it is a centralized, concentrated check-collecting operation; they will become more of a decentralized educational disbursal structure which many of us thought was the direction that it was supposed to go in the first place.

So what I am trying to do is not set in place a number of mechanical structures which people are trying to correspond to under the law, "Oops, I have

got to get this, and oops, I have got to get that"; what I am trying to do is fundamentally change the relationships within the political arena and then from those changed relationships will flow what I think is a far more beneficial structure; that is, local control of campaign financing.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for the time.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's contribution and especially his leadership in this whole area both on the task force and certainly the elections subcommittee and as ranking member of the Committee on House Administration. We really appreciate the leadership he has given in this area.

I yield to my good friend from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. I compliment my friend on the very fine contribution that is being made here this morning to a necessary dialog. I think some of the points just made by the gentleman from California are well taken. I do not know where all of this debate leads, but certainly this debate needs to occur and it has to have a very positive end result.

I would suggest that the laws of the Federal Election Campaign Act and perhaps the ethics rules of the House, which also need reforming, are too complex and cumbersome.

I can relate a personal example. In the last campaign I had 179 technical violations of FEC reports. These were omissions, because we did not know, omissions of filing someone's profession together with their name, address and the amount that they have contributed. Sometimes you might have an address that is in error, and that is considered a technical violation.

I might say also that I was executive assistant to the chairman of the first Federal Election Commission, and I have been familiar with election campaign laws since there were dramatic developments in it back in the 1970's.

So I have watched this whole evolution occur, sometimes happily and other times with dismay.

I think one of the problems is the complexity of the law and the difficulty to comply in letter as well as with the spirit of the law.

With the background that I have had with the FEC, understanding its genesis and what have you, I have sought diligently to conform with every aspect of it. But even in trying—I have an accountant, and staff people who dot every i and cross every t—it is almost impossible to not make some technical error.

I think we need to look at the complexity of the situation, the fact that it can be confusing and contradictory.

What I think we need both in campaign financing reform and in ethics reform in the House here, is rules that are very clear, understandable to ev-

eryone, that everyone can agree upon. I do not think that is all too difficult to obtain. I think we need to make it simple and we need to make the punishments severe.

But we need to know in a realistic way what the rules are and let us get beyond this quibbling about minor technicalities. Let us identify the real problem areas and address them but not get hung up on minor technicalities which can lend themselves to a great deal of finger pointing.

I want to thank the gentleman and all others who have contributed to this debate this morning and commend them on the very necessary thing they are doing. I look forward to working with the gentleman in the well and others as this matter progresses here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

I really appreciate the gentleman's remarks and his contribution.

Now as we shift a little bit, and it was a perfect transition from campaign reform to ethics reform, let me call on one of the cochairs of the bipartisan commission on ethics reform, Congresswoman LYNN MARTIN of Illinois. I am delighted that the gentleman is here.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, and I tell him that I am wearing multiple hats today. It is not just as cochairman of the ethics reform task force which is, I think, working in a bipartisan way in a manner I have never experienced around here. So my compliments to the chairman of that, Vic Fazio, and some of the other members. I am not sure if we are going to come out with everything that Members want and that the public deserves, but I must tell you that it is an experience that I believe that the House, unlike Chicago, is ready for reform. Remembering Patty Bonner, "We ain't ready for reform," but the House is. I hope the reform will not be cosmetic in nature, in the name of reform. It is not an attempt to make honest Members unable to perform but to have a simplified system which the public and Members can both understand and follow without question.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me and commend him on taking this special order on the need to reform this House. The British statesman, Edmund Burke, drew a distinction between innovation and reform. Whereas the former tended to be change for the sake of change, the latter was aimed at addressing specific abuses in a timely and temperate way for the purpose of preserving the good in the system.

Reform in order to preserve. That is our watchword today as we consider

how we might restore the people's House in this bicentennial of the First Congress. One of the most alarming trends in recent years has been the decline in the committee system and process and the consequent deterioration of what I would call deliberative democracy. We too often act as if it is more important simply to enact laws on certain problems than it is to first consider what those laws should contain.

The Republican rules package, entitled the "Bicentennial House Restoration Mandate," offered at the beginning of this 101st Congress was designed to address a whole range of problems that beset our institution. It was introduced as House Resolution 61 on February 3 by our distinguished Republican Policy Committee chairman, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, and now has 66 cosponsors. I hope the Rules Committee will give this package early consideration.

I have introduced a similar package of reforms aimed specifically at the committee system—House Resolution 106, the committee process reforms of 1989 now has 25 cosponsors. At the heart of my package of reforms is a requirement that all committees be limited to no more than six subcommittees, that members be limited to no more than four subcommittees, that committee staff be reduced by 10 percent, and that we abolish the joint referral of legislation. These steps, should help to make our committee system more manageable and accountable. Moreover, my resolution calls for restoring the May 15 reporting deadline for authorizations.

I was pleased to read in the June 6 Washington Post an op-ed piece by our Democratic colleague from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], entitled "Reinvigorating Congress." He called for ethics and campaign finance reform, and went on to call for institutional reforms. To quote from his opinion piece: "We need to reduce the excessive number of subcommittees tying up legislation, cut down the number of times the same issue is considered on the floor, and make it more difficult to miss budget deadlines."

Mr. Speaker, I commend our colleague across the aisle, and others like him, who recognize that the time has come for the House to reform itself if we are to preserve the best of our representative and deliberative system of government. And I call on them to join us in a bipartisan effort to restore the people's House to its rightful role.

At this point in the RECORD I include a summary of my committee process reform resolution:

**H. RES. 106—SUMMARY OF "COMMITTEE PROCESS REFORMS OF 1989"**

(A resolution introduced by Representative Lynn Martin to amend House Rules "to restore the committee system to its rightful role in the legislative process.")

**Sec. 1. Title.—"Committee Process Reforms of 1989."**

**Sec. 2. (a)** House Rules would be amended as follows:

(1) **Oversight reform**—Committees would be required to formally adopt and submit to the House Administration Committee by March 1st of the first session their oversight plans for that Congress. The House Administration Committee, after consultation with the majority and minority leaders, would report the plans to the House by March 15th together with its recommendations, and those of the joint leadership group to assure coordination between committees. The Speaker would be authorized to appoint ad hoc oversight committees for specific tasks from the membership of committees with shared jurisdiction. Committees would be required to include an oversight section in their final activity report at the end of a Congress.

(2) **Multiple Referral of Legislation**—The joint referral of bills to two or more committees would be abolished, while split and sequential referrals would be retained, subject to time limits and designation by the Speaker of a committee of principal jurisdiction.

(3) **Committee Elections and Organization**—Committees would be elected not later than seven legislative days after the convening of a new Congress and must organize not later than three legislative days thereafter.

(4) **Committee Ratios**—The party ratios on committees would be required to reflect that of the full House (except for Standards of Official Conduct which is bipartisan). The requirement would extend to select and conference committees as well.

(5) **Subcommittee Limits**—No committee (except appropriations) could have more than six subcommittees, and no Member could have more than four subcommittee assignments.

(6) **Proxy Voting Ban**—All proxy voting on committees would be prohibited.

(7) **Open Meetings**—Committee meetings could only be closed by majority vote for national security, personal privacy, or personnel reasons.

(8) **Majority Quorums**—A majority of the membership of a committee would be required for the transaction of any business.

(9) **Report Accountability**—The names of those voting for and against reporting measures shall be included in the committee report, and, if a measure is reported on a non-recorded vote, the names of those members actually present shall instead be listed in the committee report.

(10) **Prior Availability of Draft Report**—A draft committee report must be made available to members at least one legislative day prior to its consideration.

(11) **Committee Documents**—Committee documents intended for public dissemination, other than factual materials, must either be voted on by the committee and opportunity afforded for additional views, or must carry a disclaimer on their cover that they have not been approved by the committee and do not necessarily reflect the views of its members.

(12) **Unreported Bills**—It would not be in order, except by two-thirds vote, to consider a rule in the House on a bill that has not been reported from committee.

(13) **Committee Staffing**—Committee funding resolutions could not be considered until the House has first adopted a resolution from the House Administration Committee setting an overall limit on committee

staffing for the session. The minority would be entitled to up to one-third of the investigative staff funds, on request. The overall committee staff limit for the 101st Congress could not be more than 90% of the total at the end of the 100th Congress.

(14) **Authorization Reporting Deadline**—Committees would be required to report authorization bills not later than May 15 preceding the beginning of the fiscal year to which they apply.

(b) **Effective Date**: The provisions of the resolution shall take effect upon adoption, so far as they are applicable.

□ 1120

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. UPTON. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The gentlewoman talked about committees, and I happened to come across a statistic that I think the American public will find absolutely appalling. In the last 20 years the number of committees, standing committees, has relatively stayed the same. We have about 21, 22 committees. However, the number of subcommittee staff over the two-decade period has risen from 629 staff members to 2,085. That is a 231-percent increase, despite having, literally, no increase almost in the last 20 years in terms of the number of full committees.

The cost of operating the House in a 2-year Congress has risen from \$165 million in 1967 and 1968 to \$1.13 billion in 1987, 1988, a 585-percent increase, and most of that is the number of staff that we have increased. Just amazing numbers.

The gentleman from Wisconsin the other day talked about, when we had a press conference with our great leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], talked about the number of subcommittees that Bill Bennett, our new drug czar, has had to testify, in addition to getting prepared, 53 subcommittees he has testified in the 2 months he has been in office. Here he is supposed to be getting together a national plan on how we are going to fight drugs and reduce drugs in our country, which is due in September. In the meantime, he has to spend hours, days, and weeks testifying.

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, on that particular subject it is a perfect example, and I do know a little bit about it. We, for instance, have a committee on drugs, very hard-working committee, that is not allowed to bring legislation forward. If we really are serious about an issue such as drugs, we should, just as we made the executive do, have this one committee, whether it lasts for 2 years or 5 years, that could oversee all of this. The argument is turf. How do Members take it away from some other subcommittee? I think maybe



this House more often than it is doing should remember that the object is to accomplish something, not to just have another subcommittee on a résumé or, frankly, another press release.

I believe most Members of the House are quite decent. However, we have just gone out of control on this. I absolutely agree.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the contribution of the gentlewoman from Illinois. I do not know how we, as an institution, can criticize the executive branch or suggest they get their act together in the different agencies and departments on the drug war if we are unwilling to do so ourselves in terms of our jurisdiction and authority, legislative, over that all-important issue of trying to cleanup our streets and our neighborhoods and save our young people.

Let me, at this time, yield to one of our newer Members. I need to say that this Member, who was a public citizen and who was so moved by the cause of reform here in the Congress that it moved him to run against all odds, and to be successful in those odds. I have told this story many times around the country, although the gentleman is not aware of it, but the gentleman is an example of the citizen legislator who has been motivated to come here and help in reform. Personally, I am delighted the gentleman has chosen to contribute in these discussions. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JAMES].

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, when the former Speaker resigned from office last week, he did so gracefully, with great emotion. His words prompted deep compassion.

But, despite his words to the contrary, the former Speaker wasn't the victim of a vendetta, nor was his downfall the result of partisanship. Regretfully, his fall was the result of his breaches of House rules and ethics.

Has this disregard for ethics become the rule rather than the exception?

I know one thing—this is a sad time for the ideals of "people's government." The Speaker's ethical demise is an institutional tragedy, an American tragedy, for it reflects a branch of Government whose majority is out of touch with reality. Too many Members of Congress seem to have forgotten that we work for the people—and we're subject to their needs and their beliefs.

I agree wholeheartedly with the former Speaker that we must end the "mindless cannibalism." But there is a cancer of ethical misbehavior festering in government. It must be exorcised. No, we cannot tolerate personal vendettas and character assassination, but we will not tolerate corruption in Congress.

Sweeping and historic reforms are needed. Campaign laws must be revised—to give challengers a chance. Election to the House should not be a lifetime appointment, like the House of Lords. It's the "People's House," and it belongs to the American people, not the Members.

Ethics laws must be changed to remove the potential for corruption and punish those who are corrupt. Honoraria must be outlawed—and that includes book royalties. The American people send us to Washington to write laws, not books. If you want to be an author for hire—get out of Congress. We must close the loophole that allows retiring Members of Congress who were elected prior to 1980 to keep unused campaign funds as a personal retirement account. That's absurd.

American citizens who choose to become financially involved in the political process should not unknowingly be tricked into funding a luxurious lifestyle for a retiring politician. And we must seal shut the revolving door which ferries outgoing Members of Congress in to high paying lobbying jobs where they peddle their influence for big dollars. For too long, Congress has paid lip service to honesty and integrity while unethically operating beneath the cloak of congressional exemption and immunity. This must stop. The House should not be above the people—it is of the people, for the people, and by the people.

And House procedures must be changed to allow the views of all the people to be heard. Most Members of Congress cannot demand a vote on an issue—cannot even force the issue to the floor for debate, and are not even held accountable for how they vote so that citizens can clearly see what is happening in the House. The power cliques that control the House must be broken and the sunlight allowed to reach every corner. In the words of a great jurist—sunlight is the best disinfectant.

For 35 years Democrats have been the majority in the House of Representatives. This generation of iron-clad rule has created a warped feeling of invulnerability in the hearts and minds of some Democratic Members.

What else could explain two prominent and intelligent Members of the Democratic leadership, being forced to resign amidst ethical storm clouds?

We must strike out boldly for change now. We have an opportunity to reform an out-of-control Congress. If we cannot restore honesty and integrity, this Congress will never be able to craft and implement policies that will meet the needs of the American people.

This is not a partisan issue—it transcends partisan politics. Honesty and integrity are a national concern, a national challenge. No party, no politi-

cian is exempt from its impact and importance.

Let us learn the lesson of this embarrassing episode. Adlai Stevenson said that public confidence in the integrity of government is indispensable to faith in democracy; and when we lose faith in the system, we have lost faith in everything we fight and spend for. Let us act to restore the American people's faith in our Government. Our ability to retain our strength as a Nation hangs in the balance.

□ 1130

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the gentleman's contribution to our whole discussion here, our beginning discussion as we begin to look on an ongoing basis over the next few weeks and months to the broader concept of reform. I certainly look forward to the gentleman's willingness to continue working with us in this regard.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his very kind words.

This is a concern of ours. I think we have an opportunity, a real opportunity, to cleanse and to purify the system in which we work, and I look forward to being a part of that. In my position on the Subcommittee on Administrative Law and Governmental Relations, I hope to participate certainly on the criminal side of the ledger. As vice chairman of that subcommittee, I would say that I hope we will put forward and implement laws and suggest laws for Congress that will clarify some of the issues that admittedly may be confusing at some point.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's participation very much.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GUNDERSON. I yield again to my good friend, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make the point that I hope as we proceed on this important aspect of procedural reform that we also keep some perspective. I think it would be well for us to look historically perhaps at what has worked in the past, at what was, for whatever reason, discarded but may yet work once again. I think there are probably many lessons to be derived from the history of this body.

I have had the unique and, I might say for myself, wonderful experience of having served in this body back in the decade of the 1950's for 3 years as a page. During the decade of the 1960's, I was a staff person for the whole time here in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. During the decade of the 1970's I was a lobbyist. So I have seen the institution in close proximity from the outside. And during the decade of the 1980's I have

been a Member. So I have seen a lot of evolution over the years.

I would maintain, among other things, that we have been strongly influenced in my lifetime by the advent of television and jet air travel, and that has had a profound effect upon scheduling here in the House.

I would have to say that I think in the past couple of years there has been a marked improvement in legislative scheduling. I think this was a concern of our now Speaker, TOM FOLEY, when he was the whip, and as majority leader he addressed that matter. I have complimented him for that. We know that scheduling is much more predictable now. We know the days we are going to be here, what is going to be scheduled, and when we are going to likely have votes.

But there are other things under the heading of procedural reform that we ought to be considering. I maintain that Congress does not need to be a year-round institution. If we came here in January and buckled down the way they used to, we could get our work completed. I can remember in the 83d Congress we adjourned sine die the first week in August. We adjourned in the first week of August rather than the end of July because Robert Taft, the then majority leader of the Senate, passed away and we had a state funeral for him, and it would not have been appropriate to have adjourned on July 31 in the midst of a state funeral. So we adjourned on the 2d or 3d of August in 1953.

But if we came in here and buckled down and got organized, why could we not begin our diligent committee work, then see that legislation moves on the floor, and be out of here by July or August or September, or whenever? Times are different now than they were in the 1950's, and perhaps the pressures really are greater than they were then. But I think we could save ourselves a great deal of grief and expense and wear and tear if we came here and stayed here and worked as a legislative body. That is not to say that we should not go back to our districts in the course of the session, but maybe not with the frequency that we now feel compelled to go back, running out there every weekend because jet airplanes make that so available, and, of course, our constituents have come to expect it.

But I think we need seriously to look at things like that. Even considering ideas about committees meeting, maybe we would have to have mandatory attendance in Washington, but we could have committee meetings, say, for a 2-week period, during which the House would not meet, and then the House could meet for 2 weeks and take up the issues that were ripe for consideration that had been reported by the committees so that we could be on a readily predictable schedule that

would inject a little more order into the lives of Members and their families than currently exists.

These are just some extraneous thoughts that were evoked from the discussion here that I wanted to share with the Members for the moment. I actually look forward to working with the gentleman closely in the weeks and months ahead, and I hope to share these and some other observations. I do not think there are any magic solutions, but I think we need to view this whole issue in some historical perspective. I would be concerned that we try to invent the wheel. I think the rules to which we need to adhere are well established in custom and law. We just need to sort them out and discern which ones are practical and applicable in the decade that we are fast approaching.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the gentleman's remarks. Both the gentleman and I serve on the Committee on Agriculture in the House, and those who have been watching us over this past hour may have noticed that we were just visiting with our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA].

The gentleman from Texas made the comment during our discussions; he said, "Be careful that you don't make the inference that every Member of Congress is bad, and that Congress as an institution is totally bad."

I think that is worth mentioning because he is absolutely right. The vast majority of the Members of this Congress from both parties, both sides of the aisle, liberal and conservative, are well-meaning public servants who are here because they are trying to do what they believe is best for the country, and most of them, frankly, are here at great personal sacrifice.

I think it is absolutely important, as we begin this discussion, that we do it under the concept that we are not here to destroy individual Members of Congress; we are here to rebuild the institution under the general concept of restoring or remaking a Congress that we can be proud of.

There are four general areas of reform we need to talk about: Obviously, campaign reform; obviously ethics reform; and procedural reform becomes key because, while that is technical, it is really the key element in how we make our laws, so that becomes essential, because if we do not have good rules regarding the debate on foreign policy or public policy, we are not going to have good policy. I think from that standpoint, that may probably be as important as any of the others. Finally, there is an area that we have not in our time had much opportunity to discuss, and that is the whole concept of legislative reform.

The American public wants us to restore Congress as an institution they can be proud of, but they also want us, as a part of that, to solve the problems facing the Nation today. And there are many problems, whether it be the capital gains concern, whether it be the budget deficit, whether it be section 89, whether it be education reform, or whether it be cleaning up the environment or just a whole host of those types of issues. We need to respond to the housing needs of the younger generation, and crime and drugs probably becomes the most preeminent in that area. And we have to deal with the child care needs of the young. There is an agenda out there demanding the attention of the Congress so that we can respond to the needs of the people.

Mr. Speaker, in my closing minutes, let me yield once again to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

□ 1140

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON] has made a number of excellent points, including all of the speakers that we have had today, and I know that we would have had more speakers had we actually had votes today, but when we adjourned yesterday, there was no legislative business scheduled until next week. But this is a real opportunity for us.

Mr. Speaker, we are at a real threshold. We have a new Speaker this week. He laid down the gauntlet. He said earlier this week that we would have a package, a reform package, that would be done this session.

We have embarked on a bipartisan commission in essence to look at some of the problems, certainly correct some of those with a whole number of varieties, and I am very optimistic that we can fashion a package to make some changes around here to make this a more responsive institution to the people that we serve, and it will, therefore, clearly bring up the esteem of this institution that has lost a little bit of its luster over the last couple of months, and I think it will be great for America, truly great for America.

Certainly the good hour that we have spent here today, the discussions that we have had in the cloakrooms or on the floor during votes, certainly what we have heard from our constituents, including myself just this morning—a number of calls came in from my district—tells us the country is waiting for us to act. We need to act before they act to throw all of us out, and I think that by recognizing that problem, as we have here today, by putting a little bit of pressure on our leaders, both Republicans as well as Democrats, we can in fact make some changes, some very constructive



changes, that will see the type of reforms that the American public truly wants.

Mr. Speaker, we have just begun a new chapter in the history of the House of Representatives—the speakership of TOM FOLEY, a man whom I admire and respect. As deputy Republican whip, I have taken out this special order today to urge upon our new Speaker a new way of doing the business of the House—doing business in a way that is fair—fair to all Members of Congress and fair to the American people.

I am not here to complain about the partisanship of my Democratic colleagues. On the contrary, party rivalries are unavoidable, and—if conducted under fair rules—usually conducive to the public good. I do not want to destroy partisanship in the House. Rather, I want to help restore a competitive two-party system in the House of Representatives.

The sad truth of the matter is that there has been a steady and unmistakable erosion of fair and open debate in the House. Often only one set of ideas gets consideration; a competing set is stifled every step of the way. Committees hold hearings on items of partisan interest to the majority; equally pressing concerns which are the priority of minority members are often ignored. Certain bills come to the floor with great haste; other bills, like a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, are never considered on the House floor or even in committee.

This is not fair. Our democratic government works only if it is truly democratic. Democracy only works if all sides of each issue are represented, debated, clarified, and then decided by a fully informed and freely cast vote.

Mr. Speaker, we House Republicans are not demanding to win every vote. We are not demanding the unrealistic or the undeserved. We simply ask for fairness. Fairness for our ideas, for our membership, for the people whom we represent.

Mr. Speaker, we need to reform the way the House works and the way its Members run for election and reelection. In the area of election reform, I personally support and have cosponsored several bills to limit the influence of political action committees, and to increase the influence of the "little people" who live and work in the districts we represent.

In the area of reelection reform, I support limits on an incumbent's use of the congressional frank, and limits on the now ceaseless pursuit of PAC money.

In the area of institutional reform, I support limits on congressional staffs, on the size of Congress' budget, and on the kudzu-like encroachment on the executive and judicial branches. The congressional committee structure is a key procedural impediment, for nothing is debated on the House floor which does not move through committee. Although the number of committees in the past 20 years has remained stable, committee staff has grown out of control. In 1968 there were 629 committee staff in the entire Congress. By 1988 committee staff had tripled to more than 2,100 staff. This unfair committee structure—stacked against the minority party—results in almost tyrannical control of the House floor agenda.

In the area of procedural reforms, I support more open committee hearings and more open floor debate. The most egregious procedural violations occur in the budget area. Ten years ago only 19 percent of floor rules provided for a Budget Act waiver. Today, more than half of all rules reported by the Rules Committee waive Budget Action points of order. This is not fair.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve fairness from those of us who bear the title "Representatives." How can we as House Republicans represent the American people fully, without our voice being heard in authorizing committees, on the Budget Committee, on the Rules Committee, in conference committees, and on the House floor?

My colleagues and I have numerous suggestions to reform the House. I hope they are heard. The most promising signal that you, Mr. Speaker, could send to us and to the American people is to hear them, to adopt them, and to restore the House of Representatives as a truly representative House.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UPTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, one thing that is always brought up in the course of this discussion about Congress, and our procedure, and our practices, and our ethics and campaign laws is laws that favor incumbency, and I think there is some element of truth to that. We do have to communicate with our constituency, and we would be criticized if we did not. Somehow putting out a press release or putting out a news letter is construed as being a bad thing. I think it is one of the responsibilities of Members to communicate and to communicate frequently with their constituency, and so I think that in terms of how those practices are criticized we had better be careful.

Mr. Speaker, I refer back to my comments earlier in saying, "Let's approach this thing with some historical perspective because, you know, they say"—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair regrets to advise the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] that the 60 minutes requested has now been consumed.

Mr. GUNDERSON. With that, Mr. Speaker, let me just thank the Chair for his courtesy during this past hour and thank everyone for their participation.

Mr. Speaker, there is going to be another opportunity, I believe, today and certainly in the coming weeks.

I thank all my colleagues for their help as we begin rebuilding a Congress we all can be proud of.

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues a scholarly work that is of great value in our current efforts to reform the campaign finance laws.

This study, sponsored by the Project for Comprehensive Campaign Reform and carried

out by two distinguished academics, Prof. Herb Alexander and Larry Sabato, is unique in its scope and its thoroughness in examining the campaign finance system in America. The information revealed by this study is enlightening and extremely useful to anyone who is attempting to wade through the great number of proposals that have been put forward in this important area. Rather than attempt to retell what these two scholars have found, I include the report they prepared in the RECORD.

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

##### INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

In mid-1988 a group of participants in the federal election system, mostly PACs, began to discuss the need for a comprehensive study of proposals to reform the laws governing the election of members of Congress.

The group recognized that this is an area where there is little, if any, current and comprehensive work. It also shared frustrations that the debate on campaign reform in the 100th Congress was often too narrowly focused, driven by myths about the current system and rarely concerned with the practical outcome of the proposed reforms.

After reviewing several suggestions as to how such a study could be undertaken, the group agreed upon a study design which would test most of the current proposals against a set of questions on how they would impact the system. (See Appendix A for the study design). Two professors with extensive expertise in the field—Herb Alexander and Larry Sabato—were approached and, after making their own changes in the design, agreed to undertake the effort. (See Appendix B for background on the authors). Among the changes suggested by the authors and accepted by the sponsors were additions to the list of proposals and tests as well as the flexibility to offer proposals and ideas of their own.

The authors began their work in early 1989 by dividing up the list of reform proposals and exchange their first drafts for critique in March. The final documents for the most part reflect their shared views.

The sponsors organized themselves as the Project for Comprehensive Campaign Reform, a non-profit, non-partisan corporation. PCCR sought broad participation in funding the study. A partial list of sponsors can be found in Appendix C. While the sponsors believe strongly in the need for the study and the contribution it can make to the reform process, they do not necessarily endorse the recommendations.

##### LIMITATIONS AND EXPECTATIONS

By its very nature, a study of this type cannot be inclusive of all reforms or views. The sponsors wanted and received the views of two acknowledged experts on most of the proposals being considered recently by Congress and by those outside of Congress who have an interest in the subject.

In coming up with the questions to be applied against the proposals, the sponsors and the authors attempted to arrive at a list of generally accepted tests. Many of these tests are taken directly from the stated goals of the advocates of the various proposals—e.g. enhanced competition, amount of money in the systems, time spent raising money, etc. Nonetheless, these tests also cannot be viewed as all inclusive.

Another limitation is that the study design lists the proposals singularly when most campaign reform measures contain several interlocking provisions. While the authors have attempted to relate the pro-

posals to each other and indicate the results of tandem operation, no effort was made to assess the total impact of any specific legislative package.

Within these limitations and other resource restrictions such as time and funding, the sponsors and authors have attempted to make a major contribution to the ongoing debate over campaign finance. The effort will have been successful if it broadens the debate, adds to the understanding of the current system and helps avoid unintended consequences.

It is PCCR's intention to give the study the broadest possible circulation to policy makers, the media, academicians, political practitioners and others concerned about campaign finance. A symposium is scheduled for April 28, 1989 to unveil the study and subject it to the criticism and comment of several other experts in the field. PCCR invites and welcomes any and all reactions.

#### THE PROBLEMS AND HOW TO ATTACK THEM

Both authors express in their introductions a sense of frustration with the conduct of the current debate. Sabato emphasizes the need to differentiate "between real and pseudo (i.e., imagined) corruption". Alexander refers to "perceived influence" and "indiscriminate criticism".

Yet both lay out specific problems they see in the present system. They agree that reduced competition and increased costs are significant problems. Alexander adds to his list the "created dependency" on PACs. Sabato points to the decline of the political parties, the decrease of small donors and disclosure loopholes.

Among the goals and guidelines to be used toward improving the system, the authors offer:

**Alexander:** improve disclosure; regulate the problem areas most widely perceived as crucial; keep concentrations of power in check; use government assistance where necessary, but with least intrusion; ease fundraising and diminish dependencies; retain flexibility.

**Sabato:** eliminate real corruption and remove pseudo corruption from the debate; subtract from campaign costs without reducing communications volume; build political parties; reduce influence of large, special interests without infringing on basic freedoms; maintain and increase competition; and increase public participation by broadening the base of small donors.

Both authors caution against violating constitutional freedoms, producing unintended consequences and other limitations. Sabato warns, "... the complexity of the system and its flaws require an admission of inevitable, partial failure. The only 'perfect' solutions to some campaign financial dilemmas cause worse problems in other spheres or even abrogation of precious constitutional rights."

Alexander says "... it should be made clear at the outset that election reform is not neutral. It works to change institutions and processes, sometimes in unforeseen ways ..." and, "There is an sense of irony, that no matter how well intended election laws are, the consequences are sometimes contrary..."

Neither believes, however, that these limitations should prevent attempts to improve the system. Alexander: "This (unwanted outcomes) is not a reason to retain the status quo, because change may be desirable and perhaps should be tried. But it is a reason to weigh the possible consequences of change as carefully as possible."

**Sabato:** "The alternatives in campaign financing are sometimes presented as an unappealing choice between leaving a deteriorating system alone and instituting bad reforms. But there are other options, which together compose a multi-faceted menu of changes that addresses both corruption and unrelated problems in campaign finance."

#### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following attempts to give a quick overview of the authors' findings and recommendations. For more detailed information see the matrix charts in Appendix D where the specific proposals are applied against the tests and, of course, the complete papers by each author.

##### ALEXANDER

**Contribution Limits.**—Supports raising individual contribution limits to \$2,500 per candidate per election; raising calendar year individual limit to \$62,500 split evenly between (1) candidates and PACs and (2) party committees; indexing of limits, but maintenance of current PAC limit; opposes outright prohibition of bundling.

**Public Financing.**—Points out problems with current proposals and recommends spending floors provided by public financing, but not expenditure ceilings; any plan should cover both primary and general elections; \$2 tax checkoff to provide for Congressional elections and a separate checkoff of \$1 per year for parties, both in addition to current presidential checkoff.

**Soft Money.**—Continue use of soft money for party strengthening and citizen participation; prohibit soft money raising or spending by presidential sponsored entities; require widespread reporting of soft money with FEC maintaining separate accounts of disclosures.

**Expenditure Limits.**—Opposes limits for congressional campaigns because they have proven to be illusory and ineffective at presidential level; if enacted they should account for state size and population; recommends developing campaign cost index to replace the Consumer Price Index as measure of any expenditure limits and contribution limits.

**Tax Credits.**—Re-enact tax credits of 100% of donations up to \$50 on single return and \$100 on joint return; donations to PACs would not receive a credit.

**Wealthy Candidates.**—Opposes offsets for opponents to wealthy candidates.

**Registration and Voter Turnout.**—Encourage states to permit registration by mail and in public state offices; require U.S. Postal Service to provide forms to re-register people who move.

##### SABATO

**PAC Limits.**—Opposes increased limitations on PACs because "... the hidden costs and consequences ... are enormous and destructive"; recommends a ban on PAC double-giving and a moratorium on gifts to previously opposed candidates.

**Spending Ceilings.**—Opposes ceilings because of bias toward incumbents and because they will not control expenditures.

**Nonresident Contributions.**—Opposes ban because all districts and members are not equal in influence or ability to raise funds; argues that citizens should be free to favor or oppose candidates who are important to them regardless of where they live.

**"Zeroing Out" Campaign Treasuries.**—Opposes zeroing out because it would not achieve objective of reducing demand.

**Restricting the Fundraising Period.**—Opposes restriction mainly because it would favor incumbents over challengers.

**Banning Member PACs.**—Opposes ban because it would not effectively halt support through personal campaign committees or bundling.

**Independent Expenditures and Free Response Time.**—Opposes restrictions on independent expenditures as unconstitutional; supports disclosure, but opposes free response time as open to abuse.

**Free Media Time.**—Supports making available two hours of free time every year to national party committees and to each state party committee.

**Strengthening the Political Parties.**—Limits on individual contributions to party committees should be substantially increased; unlimited, but fully disclosed, contributions to party committees for administrative, legal and accounting expenditures; federal and state tax credits for donations to parties or a tax "add-on" for parties.

**Broadening Disclosure.**—Supports disclosure as "the single greatest check on the excesses of campaign finance, ..."; would require filing of direct mail solicitation letters; disclosure of fundraising and administrative costs and candidate selections to donors; non-connected PACs would be required to establish and disclose a fully independent, active board of directors; would require disclosure of costs of administering PACs, full disclosure of building funds, candidate related foundations and all soft money.

**Restricting Honoraria.**—Favors severe restrictions or elimination of honoraria and special interest junketing.

**Banning the Grandfather Clause.**—Supports eliminating the clause as the "outrage of outrages."

**Free Mailing for Challengers.**—Supports one free election year mailing for non-incumbent nominees.

#### SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

Because the authors were asked to study different measures, it is not possible to compare their findings. At the same time, there are items in their work where subjects overlap and comparisons are possible.

For example, both authors support stronger political parties, full disclosure across the board, higher individual contribution limits and tax incentives, check-offs or add-ons. On the issue of soft money, they both note the beneficial aspects of its use for party building and citizen participation, but want to see better disclosure and an end to abuses.

They both express the need to lessen the dependence on organized giving. However, rather than adding new restrictions on that source, they urge expansion of other sources.

While both oppose campaign expenditure limits, they appear to differ slightly as to their main rationales.

#### CONCLUSIONS

Both Alexander and Sabato use their conclusions to summarize their proposals and the arguments for them. As such, the closing sections represent the best summaries of this project. Some of their general comments deserve repetition here.

##### ALEXANDER

"The public generally is dissatisfied with what is considered to be high costs and with certain uses of political money but there is only mixed support for suggested remedies such as public financing. Good public policy is dependent upon reliable information, but there are those with a vested interest in essentially unworkable policies who sometimes provide incomplete or distorted data.



And the media often are not critical or discriminating in analyzing the offered information. Accordingly, while the public may not have a sharp definition of desirable direction, many actions costing taxpayers money may be considered by the public to be self-serving. In these circumstances, Members of Congress have some freedom of action if they have the will to surmount a certain level of public displeasure.

"While an ideal system can be proposed, consideration needs to be given to what is judged to be politically feasible. Even the ideal would be subject to unforeseen consequences as well as intended results. Even the ideal may result in the opening of new channels for money when old ones are limited or closed off.

"Yet there is clear need to be bold and constructive, and not to temporize or continue a flawed system, as we have done since 1974. The rise in campaign costs is inexorable and no system of expenditure limits will be effective in containing high levels of spending."

SABATO

"The proposals advocated here are designed to produce a better political system and a more enlightening campaign process. But no goal is more vital than the restoration of public confidence in that system and process. The many charges of corruption that have been raised in the last two decades—some accurate and some not—have almost certainly increased the level of public cynicism about politics and battered the voters' trust in the fairness of American government. That is why it is of critical importance for the next set of campaign finance reforms to solve real problems instead of imagined ones. A clear-eyed understanding of the limits of reform and a deep appreciation for constitutional freedoms that cannot be abridged will be required to create a workable, as well as a more wholesome, system of campaign finance. By contrast, if we focus on the wrong targets or insist on unrealistic perfection and purity, then we will treat symptoms and not causes and will merely create another jerry-built rig of good intentions and unintended consequences. The rig's eventual, inevitable collapse will increase public cynicism still further, and responsible, effective reform will be ever more difficult to achieve. We can and must do better in our next attempt at reform."

STEVEN F. STOCKMEYER,  
*Study Director.*

APRIL 15, 1989.

**PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 2042, AMENDMENTS TO TITLE V OF THE AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949**

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight, tomorrow, June 9, 1989, to file a report on the bill (H.R. 2042), to amend title V of the Agricultural Act of 1949 to allow producers to provide the appropriate county committees with actual yields for the 1989 and subsequent crop years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

**PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE TO HAVE UNTIL MIDNIGHT TOMORROW TO FILE A REPORT ON H.R. 2469, LIMITING RIGHT OF FIRST REFUSAL BY FHA AND FARM CREDIT SYSTEM**

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may have until midnight, tomorrow, June 9, 1989, to file a report on the bill (H.R. 2469) to limit a previous owner's right of first refusal in the case of fraud or resale for sales of farm property by the Farmers Home Administration and the Farm Credit System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

**A TRIBUTE TO DEPARTING PAGES**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, this is the season for graduations. Many of my colleagues and I have accepted invitations to deliver commencement addresses at high schools and colleges in our home districts. Here in the House of Representatives we have a commencement of our own to celebrate. Tomorrow will be the last day of work and the departure ceremony for the House Page School class of 1989.

These young men and women come to Washington from all over the United States to serve us here in the House as pages and I am proud to say that they have continued the splendid tradition of service to the Members on which we have come to depend. Peggy Sampson and Lenny Donnelly, the Republican and Democratic page supervisors, are the people who train our pages and guide them through the many tasks that make our lives easier. I would like to thank them for the work they do with the pages.

The pages perform a variety of tasks which make the job of the Members and our staffs much easier. Messages and mail, bills and briefcases are shuttled back and forth between offices by pages. The flags which we send to our constituents are delivered to the flag office and returned to our offices by the pages. The phone calls which we receive while here, in the Chamber, are received and delivered to us by pages. The whip packets are assembled and delivered to us by the pages. Even the legislative bells which summon us to vote are rung by the pages. These

jobs may not be the most glamorous on Capitol Hill, but they are extremely important to the Members and I want the pages to know that we appreciate them.

Before the pages come to the Capitol for work each day, they attend the House Page School in the Library of Congress. It is there, in the early hours of each weekday that Dr. Robert Knautz and his faculty of Shirley Alexander, Barbara Bowen, Pat Caulfield, Randy Mawer, Linda Miranda, Bob Nelson, and Ron Weitzel ensure that our youngest employees continue their education. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed that the page school is able to structure an education program that meets the needs of the diverse group of students who come to us from all over the country. Our teachers continually strive for excellence in education. Academic excellence is measured in many ways. One way is admission to the National Honor Society. I was extremely pleased to learn that, last week, 16 of our pages were inducted into the National Honor Society. This is in addition to 23 pages who had already been inducted into this prestigious organization by their home schools.

Mr. Speaker, while the pages are in Washington, they live in the Page Residence Hall. It is not always easy for these young men and women to move away from their families and friends to serve here in Washington. Adjustments must be made to new surroundings, a new school, work schedules, and new friends. Myla Moss, the residence hall director, and her staff; Monica Zunt, Jeff Hyler, Katie Siewert, Joe Tonucci, and Alisa Lewis should be congratulated for helping our pages make these adjustments. The pages really do come to be like a family while they live here. This will be evident tomorrow night and Saturday when the pages say goodbye to each other.

Another person we will have to say goodbye to is Jeff Hyler, one of the proctors at the residence hall. Jeff has graduated from college and is taking a well earned vacation before beginning training as a naval aviator this fall. I would like to thank him for his work at the residence hall and wish him well in his new duties. He has been a good friend to the pages during the past few years.

Mr. Speaker, it was 34 years ago that I graduated from the old Capitol Page School. I remember that it was a time of mixed emotions for us. We were sad to say goodbye to the friends we made here in Washington. But we were proud of the job we had done and grateful for the opportunity to serve as pages. My page experience is one of the main reasons I decided to enter public service. I hope that the experiences that this years' class have en-

joyed will help them in whatever occupation they may choose to pursue.

Mr. Speaker, as these young people prepare to return home, I would like to take this opportunity, on behalf of myself and my colleagues on the Page Board—indeed, all of our colleagues—to thank them for a job well done and to extend best wishes to them in all they do.

Mr. Speaker, I am including a list of all the pages who served us so well this past year.

#### SPRING 1989 PAGES

Adams, J. Clark.  
 Anthony, Amy.  
 Aronberg, Jill.  
 Barlow, Janice.  
 Beard, Gregory.  
 Bianchini, Gina.  
 Burton, Sherri.  
 Chambliss, Rhodi.  
 Close, Kirsten.  
 Courtright, E. Bentley.  
 Cothorn, Rachel.  
 Cronin, Kathryn.  
 Davis, Patricia.  
 Decos, A. Lissette.  
 De Los Santos, Peter.  
 Dorin, Melinda.  
 Eckel, Scott.  
 Ensign, Thomas.  
 Felton, Elijah.  
 Fowlkes, Danari.  
 Gagnon, Catherine.  
 Gast, Michele.  
 Glenn, Scott.  
 Goldberg-Meehan, Shana.  
 Hagan, Janet.  
 Henderson, Amy.  
 Henn, Stephen.  
 Holifield, Lamont.  
 Hughes, Kristen.  
 Hutcheson, Laura.  
 Jealous, Benjamin.  
 Kendall, Sarah.  
 Kingfield, Kristen.  
 Lallier, Meric.  
 Lee, Su-May.  
 Lloyd-Still, Robert.  
 McCain, Penelope.  
 McNabb, Kelsey.  
 McVicker, Carolyn.  
 Meyer, Candice.  
 Miller, J. Duncan.  
 Morris, Scott.  
 Moses, Kimberly.  
 Oros, Gabriel.  
 Parker, Anthony.  
 Pennington, Lee.  
 Perez, Ernest.  
 Peters, Lynn.  
 Quinn, Sean.  
 Roberts, Cheyenne.  
 Sanchez, Ivan.  
 Shaw, Erika.  
 Snyder, Stacy.  
 Spencer, Kyllie.  
 Stead, Lara.  
 Storey, Leslie.  
 Strasheim, Rolf.  
 Walker, J. Andrew.  
 Wells, Katherine.  
 West, Matthew.  
 Williams, Craig.  
 Williams, Thomas.  
 Winfield, Charles.  
 Zayas, Vivian.

□ 1150

#### UNDERSTANDING LATIN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to second the statement of our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] and his acknowledgment of the soon-to-be graduated class of pages. Through the years that I have had the honor to serve this institution, 28 years, it has been quite an inspiring experience to see the youth who come up here who manifest an interest and develop the loyalty and the faithfulness to serve, sometimes perhaps to an outsider in a servile or a menial task, but actually in effect exposing them to one of the greatest experiences of any democratic country, and perhaps a singular experience, given the nature of our system, in the whole world. What I have seen has been by far the hope, the promise of the real wealth, the real strength of America in these very young, hopeful, intelligent eyes that I have witnessed through the years. Both young male and female pages have been outstanding, in my book. I, for one, wish to give tribute to the particular page that I have from my district, who has served and will be graduating tomorrow with great distinction, Peter De Los Santos. He has been a marvelous young man.

I think so many people, my colleagues, outside the confines of this institution do not realize what a rigid test and requirement each one of the pages must meet in order to serve now as a page of the U.S. House of Representatives as well as the Senate.

So I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] and I want to wish godspeed and in all future endeavors nothing but success and happiness to each one of these pages who will be graduating tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, the thing that motivates my addressing my colleagues today is a matter that is not concerned with the main preoccupation of the moment, as chairman of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, that is the current crisis that is afflicting our financial institutional life in the United States. It is a great crisis, unprecedented in 55 years, but that is not what I am rising here for.

I am rising in order to continue a subject matter for discussion that I first began on April 1, 1980, the President then being President Jimmy Carter. Then later with great intensity and great travail and almost a demoralizing feeling during the entire years of President Reagan's administration.

On April 1, 1980, for the first time since I had come to the Congress in

1961, I addressed a subject matter that generally and popularly we tend to say concerning what we call Latin America, but which is, I am afraid, too pat a way for us to continue to indulge in. I think every day that goes by that we continue in this dangerous indulgence, we are in effect predicting and casting our coming generations, these pages and their children and their grandchildren, to a world that we now are shaping for them inexorably, and I think if we continue, disastrously, as I have said all these 8 years.

On April 1, 1980, I rose because and I explained then and I am going to recapitulate in order to bring coherency to what I am attempting to say today. The September prior, 1979, I had received a visit from three individuals, one of whom came from my district and had served with great distinction in what turned out to be military intelligence with the Army and who had just come back on a particular tour to attempt to visit the State Department, after having been in both the recent Nicaraguan revolution, working in behalf of the security of the American Embassy there, but later in the summer and that September in El Salvador. What he told me then and predicted occurred just like he had predicted, so his plea to me was, "Can you get hold of somebody in the administration and the White House and advise them that this and this is happening and this and this is going to happen for sure and that the U.S. Embassy and the Ambassador will be under great jeopardy?"

Well, I failed at that time. There have been administrations during which as an individual Member of the House I have had ready access and there have been those in which I have not. The one with the greatest accessibility was the first President that I served under, Mr. Kennedy, who had been a friend of mine since 1951 and with whom I had perhaps the closest personal association of any other President, including my great fellow Texan, President Lyndon Johnson. Of course, Lyndon Johnson was the most accessible public man I have ever known, even including local officials; but other administrations, including the Democratic administration of President Carter, were not quite that accessible, and I failed to convey to the proper people on the level of some judgment-making evaluations what was conveyed to me.

The other two individuals were members of a Peace Corps group that had served in Guatemala and later in El Salvador. What they said coincided with what the first one said.

Realizing that everything that had been predicted happened, including the machinegunning of the American Embassy, a serious threat to the stability of the American diplomatic



corps, as well as others, I then took the floor on April 1, 1980. It was my way of trying to communicate with the administration and the President. I appealed to the President not to succumb to the temptation of sending military contingents, because it was then that the first group was decided upon to be sent to El Salvador. Reportedly it was going to be no more than 57, but as I reminded my colleagues, it was reminiscent of what happened in 1963 in May in what turned out to be Vietnam, that I doubt seriously anybody even knew at that time where it was and what had been given to me by way of information by a then-airman in San Antonio, the same thing. I thought it was ironic that the same fact situation had arisen.

So I asked the President to please initiate diplomatic relations with the American leaders, both through his moral suasion of leadership which he then had, as well as the tangible leadership in the councils of this great body in the Organization of American States and to heed the Treaty of Rio and the understanding of Punta del Este and other prior understandings, and said categorically that I felt the administration and the United States would have no more than 90 days in order to assert its last vestigial residual influence as a leader, not a military leader, not a leader because of its superior force, but because it was a natural superior moral leader.

□ 1200

It was with great dismay that I noticed that I was, of course, completely overlooked. As a matter of fact, I will say that I have received more ridicule, at least in printed reports and even out-and-out criticisms on the part of my hometown papers, for even using special orders than I have received any other kind of notice, other than some very wonderful colleagues who have either listened or have read my words and have communicated with me their equal concern.

Be that as it may, the rest is history. Mr. Carter lost in November. Mr. Reagan came in and immediately his Secretary of State, General Haig, announced a policy of militarization. He drew the line, so to speak, and said, "I am drawing the line, and I am drawing it in El Salvador." That is the smallest nation in that whole isthmus, and it is not a north-south issue. It is an east-west issue, and he said, "We are not only going to draw the line here, if necessary we will go to the root of the cause," meaning Cuba.

That was immediately reported as not a veiled but an outright promise for direct military intervention. This was a Secretary of State talking, not the Secretary of Defense, nor the President himself. He was drawing the line. He was making it a Marxist-Len-

inist-Cuban issue. Every word that came from El Salvador, as it had from Nicaragua, was that in El Salvador we had a continuing, continuing effort on the part of the masses of people since 1932, and the bloody uprising then that was crushed brutally with the loss of over 30,000 lives, because at that time who even read about those countries, but the world has shrunk, as I pointed out in 1980.

Latin America is radically different from what it was even 5 years before, and certainly much more than it was at the time of Kennedy's announcement of the partnership, the great alliance. What it meant was that the world has contracted. It has shortened. There is not the least peasant submerged in the grossest of poverty comparable to any anywhere else on any other continent in such places as Guatemala, where we have suffered and even aided and abetted genocide against some of the most impoverished groups of Indians in those hills of Guatemala on which I have spoken out here in the House.

Anyway, it was with great dismay that time after time I would repeatedly show that what the United States was doing was evoking a 1929 Calvin Coolidge program without even an initial effort to proceed diplomatically. Usually military is called in when diplomacy has failed, but in this case intervention was immediately the program. I took the floor and denounced it. Soon after that, it became a partisan issue, and I was accused of being partisan, forgetting that I first started speaking out and was equally critical of a Democratic President.

Today, I rise because it should be obvious to me and to everybody else, and it is with great dismay that I say this, and certainly it does not give me any satisfaction to say that while it is not on the headlines, the question of Panama, which incidentally my colleagues cannot say is an issue of communism versus anticommunism or Russian penetration. So wherein can we say that the policies or the actions that have been the case of this Government of ours, sometimes with the actual aid and abettance of this Congress, have been anything but bankrupt in El Salvador after 8 years and \$4 billion-plus of investment? Where are we? We are not any closer to any kind of happy solution than we were then. In fact, we are farther away and with a negative ultimate presence of the United States, where we should be positive and affirmative, and at a time when the world is breaking into regions, Japan in the Far East almost recouping its co-sphere of prosperity of prewar Japan, in Europe where they are uniting, centralizing, and now have worked a pretty good effective common currency, monetary system, which again I have been addressing since 1979.

While they are integrating, we seem to be disintegrating. We have the natural position to be the leaders in every way in the New World. This is our co-sphere of influence and leadership. As I said for 8 years, we are not going to shoot ourselves in the hearts of what we call the Latin Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it was with great trepidation exactly 2 years ago this last March 5 that I introduced an impeachment resolution based on the fact that Mr. Reagan was violating not only our domestic laws but some of the basic international laws, and mostly because there was no question about it, that preparations were well under way for a direct invasion of Nicaragua.

Always fortunately we have had, as we have had in the civil side of our Government, real integral military advisers, but also as we have had in the civil government, always had, the danger of political penetration, and we have had political generals whose advice has cost us severely in the past, all through our history incidentally, but we have also had the professionals, and their estimates were far different from what the political generals were trying to tell the President, President Reagan.

I took this floor repeatedly. I am convinced that when Speaker JIM WRIGHT joined in speaking out in warning, he doomed himself, because he antagonized the most powerful forces of any country in any part of the world, and that I am convinced of. I have tracked from the moment he even had a dialog with Daniel Ortega, for example, but today I rise to tell my colleagues that with this stalemate in Panama, that 90 percent of it has been our making.

Gen. Manuel Antonio Noriega is a product of our confusion and our counterproductive mishmash of intelligence agencies and their incapacity to even communicate with each other. Less than 4 years ago Gen. Manuel Antonio Noriega was on the payroll of the CIA and was getting a net total of over \$200,000, which is as much as our American President receives. He was cheek-by-jowl with such characters as Colonel North, because he was like the criminal element in our country that our law-enforcement agents unhappily worked with in an effort to get somebody else, who have been so adept and so wily that they use that in order to actually win out against the law-enforcement agents.

The kind of narcotics and dope trade we have had would not be possible in our country unless there had been a hand-in-glove arrangement between the political and the business, and in this case it turned out to be even the military. It could not happen if that kind of an agreement back in the penumbra of the darkened rooms in the

Caribbean and the isthmus were not taking place.

□ 1210

And General Noriega, who is a product not of the military academy of the United States but that of Peru, he epitomizes, and it is what he has banked on up to now, that blatant nationalism that so stoutly resists Americanism, what they call American imperialism. How could this happen in Panama, where we have total control? Where we still control their currency? Why should he still remain in power? Simply because, as I was trying to assess 20 years ago, Panama was beginning to be the focal point of what I called and still call the Latin dollar market.

You have these huge international corporate and financial entities using the special laws that Panama has created, far more than even the so-called secret Swiss accounts, in order for them to launder this money. This is where Noriega successfully nourished the friendship of the chief drug merchants of the Western Hemisphere whereas at the same time, cheek by jowl, with the American intelligence agents who were saying, "Hey, he is helping us with this dope trade control."

How in the world can we say anything but that we are to blame when in 1984, for example, the election then, as soon as the election was announced the person in control declared that the vote had been won by his party, which in effect was not true; the opposition party leaders were beaten up bloodily. Did we protest? No. Who was it? It was Gen. Manuel Antonio Noriega in 1984.

And what happened after all that beating up and fraudulent election? Secretary of State George Shultz went down there to his coronation. Oh, but then in 1989, same thing, same scene, and we have to send the troops down. How were Americans treated? We have one reason here, the complexity of the situation is that we have better than 40,000 Americans that are living either in the city of Panama or elsewhere within the jurisdiction of that Government, or off the actual premises of that part of which we still have control, the bases and some parts of the commission-ruled entities.

The time to have moved was then because it was then that we had assaults on Americans. It was then that Americans were attacked.

But, no, in fact camaraderie was increased. We had, to our shame, the same thing the French had when they were fighting their colony in Algeria. The French had six different intelligence components working at odds with each other. And that is what we did. We had Army intelligence groups bugging Noriega's house while the CIA is making deals with him, DEA is

making deals with him, and Colonel North is making deals with him.

How else can this be other than making us the laughingstock?

So the reason I am getting up today is to say this: No matter what happens to Noriega, first, we are not going to be able to impose a democratic system on people who have not quite for themselves reached that point. They would all secretly love for American soldiers to move in and bring them an honest election. But if we do that, have we given democracy? That is, other than at the price of several thousand of our soldiers? Why should we have to do that when we could accomplish the same thing by using our wit and our will and just living up to the traditions of American, honest Government? That is all. That is all it would take.

That is what I told Mr. Carter on April 1, 1980. That is what I told Mr. Reagan, ad infinitum—some say ad nauseam—for 8 years. That is what I am saying today.

My friends, let me tell you something: I do not care how Noriega reports, you will not solve this problem, we still have the basic problem. We still have to learn to use our ingenuity to discern the complexity of that society.

One reason Noriega has been able to stay there and does not fear or at least, has controlled some of his subalterns. After all, it was General Torrijos with whom we made the treaty on the canal that made a system where there would be only one general; you would have about 7 colonels and about some 13 lieutenant colonels. But the tradition there is for them to follow the coterie who have studied at the same institutions, and that is at Latin American war colleges, not United States.

This has been lost sight of in America. On top of that, Noriega has been able to use the frustrations and the racial strife that exists between that part of the Panamanians of negro descent and the ruling classes that are 100 percent white.

In 1984 there was a candidate who wanted to challenge Mr. Noriega and Mr. Noriega got him, and he then said, "I am going to expose you," and he did. He accused Noriega of drug peddling, he accused Noriega of two-timing the United States with respect to the Nicaraguan so-called Contras. Why, we went so far as to get a ship from the Middle East with arms, routed through Panama, with Mr. Noriega supposedly delivering those to the Contras.

That blew up in our faces because he has been on both sides, just like a criminal who is working cheek by jowl with a trusting law enforcement agency that does not want to do the law enforcement on its own but has to have the crutch, the help of an estab-

lished criminal who sometimes out-smarts them by getting somebody else hooked and they get an immunity.

This is pretty much what has happened on the international scene with respect to Panama.

Now I will say this: We should be preparing our policies now. I do not know what will happen if Noriega is deposed. He may be deposed but you will get somebody else right now that will not be too different. It will still be military, it still will not be democratic.

The man that we backed, the deposed Delvalle, was the man that Noriega put into the presidency after 1984. The other man who did expose him was jailed and under threat of his life, was compelled to recant and then sent into exile, where he still is.

The Senate committee had hearings from the other leader, Blandon, who is on record here in sworn testimony, as to the same accusations and charges against General Noriega.

I am sure that the average Panamanian, with the exception of those whose nationalism, whose fervor is so great that they can tolerate with the fear of an American invasion and they can exalt that nationalism; but what we have got to consider is what are we going to do, no matter how Noriega goes? What should be our policy? How should we in order to keep—what is that—the respect and good opinion and the cooperation of the other nations that share with us the destiny in the Western Hemisphere? I say time is awasting. We should not fritter ourselves now on having made a heel out of a guy that we had all our national leaders doing business with and doing it in what I would consider to have been an unacceptable way had it been exposed generally.

□ 1220

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EMERSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. McEWEN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. PATTERSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. LOWEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. OBEY, for 5 minutes each day, on June 14 and 15.



## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. WYLIE.

Mr. GINGRICH in two instances.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

(The following Members (at the request of Mrs. PATTERSON) and to include extraneous material:)

Mr. WYDEN.

Mr. FORD of Michigan.

Mr. BROWDER.

Mr. ROE.

Mr. FAZIO.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 12, 1989, at 12 noon.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1332. A letter from the Secretary of Education transmitting a copy of final regulations—national diffusion network, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1333. A letter from the Secretary of Education transmitting a copy of final regulations for the student assistance general provisions and guaranteed student loan and PLUS programs, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1334. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting for the President, the annual report for 1987-88 on the implementation of section 620(s) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2370(s)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1335. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Navy's proposed lease of defense articles to Peru (Transmittal No. 19-89), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1336. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Navy's proposed lease of defense articles to Brazil (Transmittal No. 24-89), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1337. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting the semiannual report of the activities of the inspector general for the period ended March 31, 1989, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1338. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting the Department's annual report on actions taken to increase competi-

tion for contracts, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 419; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1339. A letter from the Secretary of Labor transmitting a report on activities under the Freedom of Information Act for the calendar year 1988, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1340. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the 14th annual report on the Commission's activities for 1988, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 438(a)(9); to the Committee on House Administration.

1341. A letter from the Board of Governors, U.S. Postal Service, transmitting the semiannual report on the civil misrepresentation activities of the U.S. Postal Service for the period October 1, 1988 through March 31, 1989, pursuant to 39 U.S.C. 3013 (97 Stat. 1317); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1342. A letter from the Coordinator, Governmental and Public Affairs, Tennessee Valley Authority, transmitting a copy of the Authority's statistical summaries as part of their annual report for the fiscal year beginning October 1, 1987, and ending September 30, 1988, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 831h(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

1343. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize a headstone allowance for pre-purchased grave markers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GONZALEZ: Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs. Supplemental report on H.R. 1278 (Rept. 101-54, Pt. 7). Ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. APPLEGATE (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FISH, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. COURTER):

H.R. 2584. A bill to amend the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act to improve safety with respect to the transportation of hazardous materials; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. LELAND (for himself, Mr. MOLINARI, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. TORRES, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. BATES):

H.R. 2585. A bill to control the release of toxic air pollutants, to reduce the threat of catastrophic chemical accidents, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 2586. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to provide further controls of certain stationary sources of sulfur dioxides and nitrogen oxides to reduce acid deposition, to provide for the commercialization of clean coal technologies for existing stationary sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CONTE (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. DAVIS):

H.R. 2587. A bill to conserve North American wetland ecosystems and waterfowl and other migratory birds and fish and wildlife that depend upon such habitats; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 2588. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants to State and local educational agencies and community-based organizations to provide education programs and other education-related services to inmates confined in correctional institutions, and to establish the Center for Correctional Education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DELAY (for himself, Mr.

ARMY, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. JAMES, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. COBLE, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. COX, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. GILLMOR, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WALKER, Mr. ARCHER, and Mr. ROGERS):

H.R. 2589. A bill to restore certain political rights to workers; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma:

H.R. 2590. A bill to provide a delay in the effective date of section 89 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 until July 1, 1990; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORD of Michigan (for himself and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts):

H.R. 2591. A bill to establish a national program to expand opportunities for Americans, especially students, to serve their communities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. SCHNEIDER (for herself and Mr. FRANK):

H.R. 2592. A bill to provide for a study by the General Accounting Office of recent cutbacks and transfers in personnel and resources at local offices of the Social Security Administration, to provide for a moratorium on further changes in staffing levels at such offices, and to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to provide for protective accountability for communications with the Social Security Administration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. WEISS, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. SCHEUER):

H.R. 2593. A bill to make the antitrust laws applicable for a 2-year period to any professional baseball team that unfairly deprives its supporters of the opportunity to

receive regular over-the-air television broadcasts of games in a season; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAW (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. NELSON of Florida, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. GRANT, Mr. GOSS, Mr. JAMES, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Mr. STEARNS):

H.R. 2594. A bill to name the Department of Veterans' Affairs outpatient clinic located at 1900 Mason Avenue, Daytona Beach, FL, as the "William V. Chappell, Jr., Veterans' Outpatient Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire:

H.R. 2595. A bill to authorize the detail of personnel of the Department of Defense to the Immigration and Naturalization Service for border patrol-related activities; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire (for himself, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. ROSE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. SWIFT, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ROE, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. WALSH, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, and Mr. PARRIS):

H.R. 2596. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain animals, commonly known as the Silver Spring Monkeys, to any of certain entities; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. THOMAS A. LUKE, Mr. ECKART, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BATES, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. GEJDESON, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. VENTO, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H.R. 2597. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to improve compliance with hazardous waste laws at Federal facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BATES (for himself, Mr. PORTER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MOODY, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. DYSON, Mr. FROST, Mr. HILER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. CONTE, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FRANK, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GOSS, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REGULA, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SAVAGE):

H.J. Res. 291. Joint resolution designating November 16, 1989, as "Interstitial Cystitis Awareness Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota (for himself, Mr. LELAND, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. PENNY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. AU COIN):

H. Con. Res. 145. Concurrent resolution urging the President to refocus foreign as-

sistance, particularly food assistance to Central America, to reintegrate refugees and displaced people into the economic mainstream of Central American nations, and to improve the health, nutrition, and education levels of children, women, and others most in need; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H. Con. Res. 146. Concurrent resolution to designate January 25, 1990, as "American Coal Miner Day" in honor and recognition of the centennial anniversary of the United Mine Workers of America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SMITH of Vermont, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. COX, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. HERGER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. RITTER, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. EVANS):

H. Con. Res. 147. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding admissions of minority students to institutions of higher education; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and the Judiciary.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

143. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to the Federal deficit; to the Committee on Government Operations.

144. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Hawaii, relative to the Federal deficit; to the Committee on Government Operations.

145. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, relative to the expansion of Hawaii's international role in astronomy; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 14: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 45: Ms. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 102: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 187: Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WILSON, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. LEATH of Texas, and Mr. SARPALIUS.

H.R. 188: Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. WILSON, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. LEATH of Texas, and Mr. SARPALIUS.

H.R. 454: Mr. ROE, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. HORTON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. WOLF, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ROYBAL, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 633: Mr. DYSON and Mr. SMITH of Mississippi.

H.R. 720: Mr. HORTON.

H.R. 755: Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 775: Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 799: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota and Mr. DONNELLY.

H.R. 965: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 995: Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. DICKINSON, and Mr. SMITH of Mississippi.

H.R. 1005: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 1083: Mr. SPENCE, Mr. McNULTY, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. WALSH, Mr. PARKER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mrs. COLLINS, and Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 1181: Mr. IRELAND, Mr. LEATH of Texas, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1199: Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ROWLAND of Georgia, and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 1291: Mr. McCURDY, Mr. KASTENMEIER, Mr. ROE, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. WILSON, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, and Mr. DORNAN of California.

H.R. 1400: Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. DYSON, Mr. SKELTON, Ms. LONG, Mr. FROST, Mr. JONES of Georgia, and Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 1416: Mr. DARDEN, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. PAXON, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. ROBERT F. SMITH, Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SCHAEFER, and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 1465: Mr. PRICE, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. DEFazio, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1499: Mr. PARKER and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 1643: Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 1823: Mr. HUTTO.

H.R. 1852: Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PANETTA, and Mr. BRENNAN.

H.R. 1860: Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. TORRES, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. UDALL, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. McCLOSKEY, and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 1931: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.

H.R. 2051: Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2273: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. AU COIN, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. STOKES, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WALSH, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ROE, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. BATES, and Mr. HERTEL.

H.R. 2358: Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. CONTE, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. FASCELL, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 2420: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 2421: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 2460: Mr. RITTER, Mr. TALLON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. BEVILL.

H.R. 2499: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. McCLOSKEY, and Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 2504: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.J. Res. 111: Mr. WOLF, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. KASICH, Mr. RAY, Mr. ROE, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. GEJDESON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr.



CARPER, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. PARKER, Mr. FLIPPO, and Mrs. COLLINS.

H.J. Res. 204: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. OWENS of Utah, and Ms. SNOWE.

H.J. Res. 230: Mr. DEWINE, Mr. AKAKA, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TANNER, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. WELDON, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. CROCKETT, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. ASPIN.

H.J. Res. 274: Mr. LENT, Mr. RHODES, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. BARNARD, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. WHITTAKER, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. WALSH, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. FROST, Mr. FLORIO, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. ENGEL,

Mr. PICKLE, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. MAVROULES, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BROWN of Colorado, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. TAUKE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. PORTER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LaFALCE, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. PARKER, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SLAUGHTER of Virginia, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RITTER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. McCRERY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. DENNY SMITH, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. YATES, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. HILER, Mr. PAXON, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. PASHAYAN, Mr. WELDON,

Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. HENRY, Mr. STANGELAND, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. QUILLIN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. RAY, Mr. BRENNAN, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. FRANK, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Con. Res. 87: Mr. GREEN, Mr. PENNY, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. HORTON, Mr. GALLO, Mr. HILER, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. DYMALLY, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FAWELL, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. FAZIO.

H. Con. Res. 130: Mr. AuCOIN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H. Res. 120: Ms. SNOWE and Mr. INHOFE.